

fresh

modern language notes

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

DEC 19 1958

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

VOL. LXXIII, NO. 8, DECEMBER 1958

-
- 561 Tertullian and "A Modest Proposal." JAMES WILLIAM JOHNSON
- 563 Wolsey in *The Vanity of Human Wishes*. C. B. RICKS
- 569 Coleridge as Nehemiah Higginbottom. DAVID V. ERDMAN
- 580 James's *Madame de Mauves* and Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter*.
ROBERT F. GLECKNER
- 587 Edith Wharton on Critics and Criticism. ERIC LAGUARDIA
- 589 The Protagonist of Hemingway's "The Killers." OLIVER EVANS
- 591 The Grail in the *Parcevals* Saga. P. M. MITCHELL
- 594 The Source of du Bellay's "Les Louanges d'Amour."
CAROL HOPKINS MADDISON
- 597 The Abbé Goujet's "Pot-pourri." SPIRE PITOU
- 601 Baudelaire and Corneille: A Parallel. JOHN VAN EERDE
- 603 On Zola's Habits of Revision. JOHN C. LAPP

REVIEWS

- 612 AGOSTINO LOMBARDO, *Il dramma pre-Shakespeariano: Studi sul teatro inglese dal Medioevo al Rinascimento* (HARDIN CRAIG)
- 613 PAUL A. JORGENSEN, *Shakespeare's Military World* (ALLAN GILBERT)
- 615 R. M. MILES, *Serial Publication in England before 1750* (W. S. WARD)
- 616 A. H. SMITH, *English Place-Name Elements* (HAAKON HAMRE)
- 620 G. MALCOLM LAWS, JR., *American Balladry from British Broad-sides* (FRANCIS LEE UTLEY)
- 622 QUENTIN ANDERSON, *The American Henry James* (ROY HARVEY PEARCE)
- 625 CALENDRE, *Les Empereurs de Rome*, ed. GALIA MILLARD (URBAN T. HOLMES, JR.)
- 628 KIMBERLY S. ROBERTS, *An Anthology of Old Portuguese* (THOMAS R. HART, JR.)
- 629 DENIS DIDEROT, *Salons, Volume I: 1759, 1761, 1763*, ed. JEAN SEZNEC and JEAN ADHÉMAR (EVA MARCU)
- 631 CHARLES BAUDELAIRE, *Les Fleurs du mal*, ed. MARCEL A. RUFF (W. T. BANDY)
- 632 NEAL OXENHANDLER, *Scandal and Parade—The Theater of Jean Cocteau* (GERMAINE BRÉE)
- 634 H. W. BELMORE, *Rilke's Craftsmanship. An Analysis of his Poetic Style* (GUENTHER RIMBACH)
- 635 R. HINTON THOMAS, *Thomas Mann. The Mediation of Art* (EDGAR LOHNER)
- 637 P. G. FOOTE, ed., *Gunnlaugs Saga Ormstungu*, with an English trans. by R. QUIRK (STEFÁN EINARSSON)
- 639 M. B. SALU, trans., *The Ancrène Riwle* (JOHN H. FISHER)

modern language notes

NATHAN EDELMAN,
General Editor

WOLFGANG E. THORMANN,
Managing Assistant

DON CAMERON ALLEN
CHARLES R. ANDERSON
STEFÁN EINARSSON
RENÉ N. GIRARD
RICHARD H. GREEN
THOMAS R. HART, JR.
ANNA G. HATCHER
HAROLD JANTZ
WILLIAM H. McCLAIN
J. HILLIS MILLER
LAWRENCE J. ROSS
CHARLES S. SINGLETON
EARL R. WASSERMAN

Published eight times annually, November through June. Subscription: \$6.00 in the United States; \$6.25 in Canada; \$6.50 in other countries. Single issue, \$1.00. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Md. Claims for replacement of missing numbers must be received within 3 months (6 months in the case of foreign subscribers) following publication of the number.

Contributors and publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to *Modern Language Notes*, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped return envelope. In preparing manuscripts, contributors are requested to follow the MLA Style Sheet.

Entered as Second-class Matter at the Baltimore, Md., Postoffice. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Sec. 1103, Act of Congress, 16 July 1894.

lai

v)

AR

ugh
6.25
1.00.
ould
Md.
be
for-
ber.

ipts
The
very
urn
are

id.,
of
ess,

dal

r
l
r

T

al
G
n
P
c
c
s
l
t
p
S
o
A

gh
25
00.
ld
d.
be
er.

ts
e
y
n
e

f
v

T
v

modern language notes

VOL. LXXIII, NO. 8, DECEMBER 1958

Tertullian and "A Modest Proposal"

Although Jonathan Swift has been a prime object for source hunters almost since his own day, with the result that the *Tale of a Tub* and *Gulliver's Travels* have been copiously annotated, there have been almost no suggestions as to possible sources of influence on "A Modest Proposal." Sir Walter Scott noted that in its recommendation of infant cannibalism as a solution to extreme poverty the "Proposal" bore certain resemblances to a suggestion advanced during the time of the siege of Jerusalem.¹ Charles Townsend Copeland suggested that legendary tales of the devouring of infants by the Cavaliers during the Civil War, as well as a reference to *paidophagy* in Act III of a play, the *Old Troop, or Monsieur Ragout*, may have been known to Swift.² But it would appear that the most obvious and direct influence on Swift's proposal, stylistically as well as thematically, was the *Apologia* of Tertullian.

Tertullian's *Apology*, a defense of Christianity notable for its acerb and honed style, was a work with which Swift was familiar and of which he was apparently quite fond. As early as the 1690's, Swift

¹ Sir Walter Scott, ed., *The Works of Jonathan Swift* (London, 1883), I, 341.

² Charles Townsend Copeland, "On Dean Swift's 'A Modest Proposal,'" in *The Harvard Advocate Anthology*, ed. Donald Hall (New York, 1950), pp. 46-49.

was making abstracts of Tertullian and other church fathers at Moor Park; and at the time of his death in Dublin in 1745, he still retained an edition of Tertullian's works in his library.³ The most obvious testament to Swift's affinity to Tertullian, however, lies in the striking structural and stylistic parallels between the *Apology* and "A Modest Proposal."

Tertullian's defense of Christianity was undertaken because of the persecution of Christian converts by the Romans on the grounds that the religious sect was engaging in inhuman practices and that its adherents were, therefore, not to be treated as human beings. The exact nature of the charges of animalism against the Christians is first disclosed when Tertullian ironically exclaims that Roman officials had undertaken a fruitless investigation to discover "how many murdered babies each of us [Christians] has tasted"; then he scathingly remarks, "Oh! The glory of that magistrate who had brought to light some Christian who had eaten up to date a hundred babies!"⁴

Having established the idea of cannibalism and postulated the attitude of a Roman "projector," Tertullian goes on in the best Swiftian fashion to identify himself with the projector's point of view and carry it to its logical conclusion. Very well then, he declares, let us accept the absurd premise that the Christians ceremonially eat children and reconstruct the process. First the Christian initiate must approach the "father" of the ritual to make preparations, who would instruct him as follows: ". . . you must have a baby, still tender, that can know nothing of death, that can smile under your knife; *item*, a loaf, to catch its juicy blood. . . ."⁵ Tertullian envisions the actual ceremony in all its grisly horror: "Come! Plunge the knife into the baby, nobody's enemy, guilty of nothing, everybody's child; or if that is the other man's job, do you just stand by (that is all), by this human creature dying before it has lived; watch for the young soul as it escapes; catch the infant blood; steep your bread with it; eat and enjoy it."⁶

Having scored his point, Tertullian underlines it by substituting his own premise in place of the false one that Christians are sub-human: "You, sir, who cannot do the thing [i. e., eat children] ought

³ Cf. Edward Bensley, "The Library at Moor Park," *N & Q*, CLIX (1930), 48; Harold Williams, *Dean Swift's Library, With a Facsimile of the Original Sales Catalogue* (Cambridge, England, 1932).

⁴ Tertullian, *Apology*, Loeb ed. (London, 1931), II. 5.

⁵ VIII. 7.

⁶ VIII. 1-2.

not to believe it of another. For a Christian too is a man, and exactly what you are."⁷ Yet human depravity is such that men will attempt to justify their own cruelty toward other men by accusing their victims of being lower than human: "Man's flesh goes belching, fattened on man's flesh."⁸

When he contemplated the Anglo-Irish situation in the 1720's, Swift found much that could remind him of the persecution of the Christians by the Roman officials. A minority was being victimized by a group that held economic and governmental control over them on the grounds that they were little more than animals. Very well, declares Swift, grant that the Irish are "dams" and "breeders," the projector is then free to follow his premise to its logical conclusion. Swift's matter of fact tone parallels Tertullian's: in the factual proposal, in the itemized calculations regarding price; in the same hideously violent account of the butchering of the children. And there is the same dreadful discussion, carried on in the most acidly serene tone, about the actual eating of the baby, though the refinements of cooking and seasoning are Swift's own.⁹

It has been said of the *Apology*, "As an argument, it is magnificent; and Tertullian's command of sarcasm is unsurpassed in history. But this is defiance, not persuasion; bitter satire, not gentle pleading. . . ." ¹⁰ With the qualification that Tertullian's sarcasm has been at least equalled by Swift, we may accept the rest of the evaluation as being also true of "A Modest Proposal."

University of Rochester

JAMES WILLIAM JOHNSON

Wolsey in *The Vanity of Human Wishes*

The purpose of this note is to suggest that Johnson, in his description of the fall of Wolsey in *The Vanity of Human Wishes* (imitated from Juvenal's *Sejanus*), may have had in mind the attacks made upon Sir Robert Walpole by comparisons with both Wolsey and

⁷ VIII. 5.

⁸ IX. 11.

⁹ Jonathan Swift, "A Modest Proposal," in *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift*, ed. Herbert Davis (Oxford, 1955), XII, 110-116, *et passim*.

¹⁰ Henry M. Gwatkin, quoted in *Apology*, p. xix.

Sejanus. These attacks appeared in the opposition newspapers mainly from 1726 to 1731, but they were referred to many times thereafter, and achieved a more general circulation when Pope made use of them in both Dialogues of his *Epilogue to the Satires*. I shall show the extent of the attacks on Walpole as a second Wolsey, and also (more briefly) those which make use of Sejanus; but I must make it clear that I am not suggesting that the details of Johnson's Wolsey should be wrested to make them apply to Walpole (or, in fact, that there is any cryptic intention). My point is the small and entirely subsidiary one that there may be an altogether delicate allusion, since Johnson (and his alert contemporary) may have remembered the identification of the two statesmen.

The main source is *The Craftsman*.¹ On 30 December 1726 it presented a "little Sketch of Cardinal Wolsey's Fortune"; on 24 February 1726/7 it referred again to Wolsey; and on 18 November 1727 it dealt at some length with Wolsey in *Henry VIII*, and concluded: "Reflecting People may observe from this Picture how like human Nature is in her Workings at all Times." On 24 February 1727/8, it was ironically cautious: "Every one, I suppose, will judge that I can mean nobody but Cardinal W———." Then followed the liveliest of *The Craftsman's* attacks; on 6 April 1728 it announced: "The following Memorial, inscribed on a large Marble Pillar, was lately found amongst some Ruins at Whitehall. It is supposed to have been formerly fixed there, by Order of King Henry VIII when Cardinal Wolsey fell under Disgrace. . . . I am much obliged to the Gentleman, who communicated it to me, and doubt not that it will prove an agreeable Entertainment to some of my Readers, as I hope it will be a Warning to others."² The Latin inscription was translated into English verse in the next issue of *The Craftsman*, on 13 April 1728. But further resources were found in the device, and on 25 May there was published a letter protesting against the indiscriminate attack on the original Wolsey, with an inscription on his virtues. With the help of an editorial comment, Walpole is thus neatly attacked for having Wolsey's vices and for not having his virtues. On 8 February 1728/9, there is "A Panegyrick on Cardinal W———," and on 22 February an account of Wolsey supposed to have been written by William Cecil,

¹ For the years 1726-36, I have used *The Craftsman* Nos. 1-511, 14 vols. (1731-37).

² The inscription was reprinted, with the other epigrams on Wolsey, in *A Collection of Poems on Several Occasions* . . . , by Caleb D'Anvers (1731).

Lord Burleigh. The similar attacks on Sejanus join those on Wolsey, on 8 March: "I have often observed, with Pleasure, that *Ben Johnson's Fall of Sejanus* hath not been acted for many Years; and I could wish that the *Fall of Cardinal Wolsey*, as drawn by *Shakespeare*, in his *History of Henry the eight*, may not be exhibited any more." On 15 March appeared "*To a Certain Gentleman, who takes the Character of Card. Wolsey to Himself. An Epigram*"; and on 29 March 1729 there was a casual reference to "a *Premier Minister* (I suppose *WOLSEY*)."³ Two epigrams on Wolsey were reprinted in the Appendix to Volume V of *The Craftsman* (1731). References to Wolsey also appeared in *The Craftsman* on 7 June 1729; on 13 June 1730; on 5 December 1730 (an attack by Bolingbroke, which was reprinted as Letter X in his *Remarks on the History of England*, 1743); and on 5 June 1731.

During this period the use made of Sejanus was equally vigorous. (Walpole was in fact attacked with the help of many historical and fictitious persons, but Wolsey and Sejanus are the most important, frequent and telling of them.) On 30 December 1727 there was an Advertisement in *The Craftsman*: "POLITICAL CARDS; describing, in beautiful and instructive Prints, the terrible, tragical Ends of wicked Ministers in all Ages and all Nations; viz. 1. Sejanus, the Favourite of the Emperor Tiberius. . . ." On 6 July 1728 there was an account of Sejanus which included seven lines of Juvenal's Tenth Satire, with Dryden's translation. Further references to Sejanus appeared in *The Craftsman* on 14 September 1728; on 8 March 1728/9 (quoted above); on 7 June 1729; and on 14 February 1729/30.

The attacks were certainly at their strongest from 1726 to 1731, but references continued for many years, and were often taken up by government writers.³ Thus Hervey's *Observations on the Writings of the Craftsman* (anon., 1730) remembered that "The *Sejanus's* and *Wolsey's* of former Ages, the *Menzikof's* and *Coscia's* of later Dates, were described in their blackest Colours." The pamphlet *Some Observations on the Present State of Affairs* (1731) ridiculed the idea that the Minister was worse "than all the *Sejanus's* and *Wolsey's* in the World together." For the opposition, Pulteney (in *An Answer to One Part of a late Infamous Libel . . .*, anon., 1731) mentioned "your great Predecessors, *Sejanus*, *Wolsey*, and *Buckingham*." The pamphlet *A Proper Reply to the Remarks on the Craftsman's Vindi-*

³ I am indebted to Laurence Hanson's *Government and the Press 1695-1763* (1936), pp. 25-27.

cation of his two Patrons [1731] complained that Walpole had been enabled "like his Predecessor W——y, to adorn the County of his Nativity with a Palace." On 7 October 1731, *The Free Briton*, a government paper, imagines the opposition writers as saying, "We do therefore, *Nemine Contradicente*, resolve and adjudge, that he, *this Person, at present in Power*, is a most infamous, wicked Minister, worse than *Sejanus, Wolsey, or Villars*."

Intermittently, the attacks continued. On 1 June 1734 *The Craftsman* made use of *Sejanus*, and so did the poem *A View of the Town* (1735). On 4 September 1736, *The Daily Gazetteer* complained that "antient and modern Story was ransack'd for *Sejanus's* and *Wolsey's*, to belye and abuse the Greatest Minister of the Age." *The Hyp-Doctor* (11 January 1736/7) mentioned *Sejanus* to mock the opposition writers, but the sneer did not prevent *The Craftsman* from again introducing Jonson's *Sejanus* (2 July 1737). *Common Sense*, on 21 May 1737, quoted six lines on *Wolsey*, which are from Fielding's play, *Eurydice Hiss'd, or, A Word to the Wise* (published in 1737 with *The Historical Register for the Year 1736*). On 12 February 1736/7, *The London Journal* had ridiculed the idea that England had been under "Ministers wickeder than *Sejanus, Rufinus, Cochran, Wolsey, Menzicoff, or Coscia*"; and it mentioned *Sejanus* again on 24 December 1737.

On 13 May 1738 (the same day as Johnson's *London*) was published the first Dialogue of Pope's *One Thousand Seven Hundred and Thirty Eight*. The second Dialogue followed in July 1738; and in 1740 the whole was given the title *Epilogue to the Satires*. In 1738, *Wolsey* appeared only in the second Dialogue:

But pray, when others praise him, do I blame?
Call *Clodius, Wolsey*, any odious name?⁴

In the edition of 1740, *Sejanus* and *Wolsey* appeared also in the first Dialogue, instead of *Aegysthus* and *Verres*:

Sejanus, Wolsey, hurt not honest FLEURY,
But well may put some Statesmen in a fury.

To this, Pope added a note, which was published in Warburton's edition of 1751:

Sejanus, Wolsey] The one the wicked minister of Tiberius; the other, of Henry VIII. The writers against the Court usually bestowed these and other

⁴ 1740: *Verres, Wolsey*. Pope's *Imitations of Horace*, ed. John Butt (Twickenham ed., vol. iv), 2nd ed., 1953, pp. 301, 302, and 321.

odious names on the Minister, without distinction, and in the most injurious manner. See Dial. II v. 137 [quoted above].

Professor Butt adds: "Walpole had been obliquely compared with Wolsey, Verres, and Sejanus in *The Craftsman* (nos. 8, 259, 413)"—but the comparison was more than oblique. These references in Pope are of great importance, not only because they help to bridge the years between the original attacks and *The Vanity of Human Wishes* (1749), but also because we see the "odious names" being given both a wider circulation than that of the political writers and also a more permanent form.

The comparisons went on. *Old Common Sense* (27 January 1738/9) gave "a short Extract from a Play call'd *Sejanus*"; and on 3 February it published an epitaph on a minister even worse than his supposed predecessors, among them Wolsey. Fielding's paper, *The Champion*, on 10 April 1740, mentioned (among others) Wolsey in a comparison with Walpole, and again used Wolsey as an example on 8 May. James Miller's poem, *Are these Things So?* (anon., 1740), declared:

No! with the *Curs'd* your Tomb shall foremost stand,
The GAVESTON's and WOLSEY's of the Land.

Yes, they are (1740) said that historical parallels were inadequate: "What is a WOLSEY, GAVESTON to me?"; and it recommended suicide as Walpole's only escape:

This might to future *Times* record his Fame,
And W——e's live with Great SEJANUS' Name.

An Historical View of the Principles, Characters, Persons, &c, of the Political Writers in Great Britain . . . , 1740, [signed Marforio] attacks the methods of the opposition: "On the other hand, if a Minister is to be libelled, throw all the Ambition, Avarice, and Pride of *Wolsey*, into one Group, and place them in the strongest Point of Light . . . *Sejanus* has been a perfect Mine of smart Things that have been said against wicked Ministers." *The Art of Poetry* (1741) shows a "Patriot Bard" demanding, "Is my *Sejanus*, and my *Wolsey* lost?" That the attacks were remembered on both sides is shown by the comment in *The Conduct of the Late Administration* (1742), which vindicates Walpole: "Have not they ransack'd all Authors ancient and modern, for invidious Parallels, in order to render him obnoxious to his Prince, and odious to the People?" Walpole had resigned on 11 February 1741/2, and he died on 18 March 1744/5.

In 1763 appeared Edward Burnaby Greene's *Satires of Juvenal Paraphrastically Imitated, and adapted to the Times*. Greene described it as "a LIBERAL IMITATION," and it is certainly loose and rambling; but it is perhaps of interest because, in his version of the Tenth Satire, he follows a description of the "slaves of state" crushed under their own building (the closing lines of Johnson's Wolsey) with: "Whence wither'd droops a W-lp-le's sully'd fame?"

Professor Nichol Smith and Professor McAdam say that "*London* could be regarded by the 'patriots' as a political manifesto . . . , A good commentary on this political element is supplied by an article in *The Craftsman* published on the same day as *London*, and reprinted in *The Gentleman's Magazine*. It begins with a reference to Juvenal, and deals with some of the same topics as the poem."⁵ Perhaps this political element is not altogether missing from *The Vanity of Human Wishes*, and to conclude I shall sum up the points which suggest that Johnson would have known of the attacks and so may have had Walpole in mind when describing the fall of Wolsey. First, there is the point that the method of Johnson's *Marmor Norfolciense* (1739)—his "most bitter and sustained attack on the government of Sir Robert Walpole"⁶—may have been suggested not only by Swift's *Windsor Prophecy* (1711), but more specifically by *The Craftsman's* inscription on Wolsey (1728). Second, that the lines of attack on Walpole both as Wolsey and as Sejanus come together in Johnson's imitation of Juvenal (indeed, as previously mentioned, *The Craftsman* of 6 July 1728 quoted seven lines of Juvenal's description of Sejanus, with Dryden's translation). Third, the fact that Pope twice refers to these bitter comparisons will have ensured a wide circulation for them.

Balliol College, Oxford

C. B. RICKS

⁵ *Poems of Samuel Johnson*, ed. D. Nichol Smith and E. L. McAdam (1941), p. 2.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 108.

Coleridge as Nehemiah Higginbottom

In the *Monthly Magazine* for November 1797, there appeared three burlesque "Sonnets, attempted in the Manner of 'Contemporary Writers,'" signed "Nehemiah Higginbottom," and contributed, as all his friends immediately knew, by Samuel Taylor Coleridge. One of the sonnet-writing friends, Charles Lloyd, pathologically sensitive, was able to channel his own annoyance into the act of persuading another contemporary sonnet writer, Robert Southey, that the public joke was intended to be on *him*. Lloyd succeeded easily, because Southey as well as Lloyd had become somewhat "miffed" with Coleridge, to use a word that figures in the parody; and Charles Lamb, too, was persuaded that Southey was the butt. In short the Higginbottom sonnets set off a train of more or less bitter misunderstandings between Coleridge and his already irritated friends, and none would believe his various explanations and denials. To this day the precise nature of Coleridge's parody has remained uncertain.

To supply clarification by examining the sonnets of Nehemiah Higginbottom and the context of their publication is the aim of the present note. We shall see that Southey and his friends were mistaken in supposing his poetry the direct target of Coleridge's mockery, yet that there was reason to fear it would appear so in the public eye. And we shall find that Coleridge was able to permit himself to indulge in this merry act of hostility partly because, in a technical sense at least, most of the blows he gave could be described as directed against himself.

On one level the ridicule of "Contemporary Writers" represents a stage in the growth of Coleridge's own critical values. Having with some misgivings recently pushed through the publication of *Poems, By S. T. Coleridge, Second Edition. To which are now added Poems By Charles Lamb, And Charles Lloyd*, the main author, counting the "effusions" of Lamb and Lloyd as a part of his own folly, laughs cathartically at the whole performance—and then sells his laughter to the *Monthly Magazine* before sharing it with his collaborators. "I sent three mock Sonnets," explained Coleridge in a letter to Cottle, "in ridicule of my own, & Charles Lloyd's, & Lamb's, &c &c—in ridicule of that affectation of unaffectedness, of jumping & misplaced accent on common-place epithets, flat lines forced into poetry by Italics (signifying how well & *mouthis[h]ly* the Author would read them) puny pathos &c &c—the instances are almost all taken from

mine & Lloyd's poems."¹ This Cottle modified, with justification from the first part of the sentence, to: "almost all taken from myself and Lloyd and Lamb."² "I think," Coleridge added, "they may do good to our young Bards.—"

In his own "youth" of the previous three years Coleridge had frequently poured out his soul in Odes and Effusions (the latter only tardily called Sonnets, a term perhaps more critically deprecatory than we realize). Of the fifty-one items in his first edition of *Poems* (1796) twenty had been sonnets, four of them supplied by Lamb. At the end of the same year he had prepared a "sheet of sonnets" (four of his own and twenty-four by others) for private circulation, with an introductory essay, not intentionally ridiculous, displaying scorn of Petrarch and a willingness to deduce the laws of the English sonnet from the practice of Charlotte Smith and Bowles, and defining the sonnet as "a small poem, in which some lonely feeling is developed."³ By "lonely" he meant "one only," say editors imbued with a Coleridgean spirit of reinterpretation, but they are wrong; even two years earlier he had defined sonnets as "melancholy Children of the Muse" "that develope my lonely Feelings" and "are scarcely fit for the hard Gaze of the Public" (*CL*, I, 146). In the Preface to his first *Poems* he defended the writing of "Sonnets or Monodies" in which we "describe our own sorrows" as an essential and interesting form of "Egotism" (*PW*, II, 1144). By the time he came to prepare his second edition, in the spring of 1797, he found that many of these effusions of pathetic egotism were not fit for the hard gaze of his own criticism. To the introductory essay he added a confession: "The Sonnet has been ever a favourite species of composition with me; but I am conscious that I have not succeeded in it" (*PW*, II, 1146). And he edited accordingly: "From a large number I have retained ten only [from the first edition], as seemed not beneath mediocrity. Whatever more is said of them, ponamus lucro [we need the money]." It is true that he added eight more to the ten and that he now called them "Sonnets" instead of "Effusions." But I suspect that to his ear the new term was more, not less, belittling; he was turning less against effusions of pathos than against "puny pathos" (see above). And he now hedged in the half-title: "Son-

¹ *Collected Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, ed. Earl Leslie Griggs (Oxford, 1956), I, 357-358. Hereafter cited as *CL*.

² Joseph Cottle, *Early Recollections* (1837), I, 289.

³ Reprinted in *Complete Poetical Works*, ed. Ernest Hartley Coleridge (Oxford, 1912), II, 1139. Cited as *PW*.

nets, / *Attempted in the Manner* / Of The Rev. W. L. Bowles. . . .” During the next twenty years he would be guilty of only three original sonnets, not to count the Higginbottom parodies.

Seldom content with going only far enough, Coleridge, having retreated thus far in his second edition, went on to the extreme of parody and self-parody in the “Sonnets Attempted in the Manner of ‘Contemporary Writers’”—just as, again and again, he felt impelled to blazon forth his various recantations and retirements. At the same time, to one who needed money from the sale of his *Poems*, this attention-getting device may easily have justified itself as legitimate advertising.

From the beginning Coleridge had no respect for the special prosodic structure of the sonnet.⁴ His laughter was now directed at the “lonely” poem as such, whether Monody or Sonnet or Effusion, and at the “manner” of egoistic expression in any form, though “sonnet” was a good term for the imputation of smallness. When he returned to the subject years later in the *Biographia Literaria* (chapter 1) he dwelt exclusively upon “the general tissue of the style,” a matter partly of spirit or tone but chiefly of diction.

The actual timing of Higginbottom’s public appearance tells us something about the nature of Coleridge’s new critical—and self-critical—awareness. Was it mere coincidence that he sent off his “three mock sonnets” against certain contemporary writers only after the reviews of his and Lamb’s and Lloyd’s *Poems* had begun to point the way? It seems rather probable that one precipitating cause of this sudden embarrassment about his own and his collaborators’ “simplicity” and “affectation of unaffectedness” (see above) was a review of the *Poems* in the *Monthly Visitor* for August 1797 (II, 180) which had this to say:

There is much simplicity, sweetness, and promise in the poetry of Lloyd. What we have said of Mr. Lloyd will partly apply to his friend Charles Lamb: The pieces which this gentleman has contributed . . . entitle him to considerable praise. It will be seen that he has a nearer resemblance to Coleridge than that which appears in Mr. Lloyd. He is strong and harmonious; but he is not so affecting as the last writer.

When we spoke of the Coleridgean school, we meant not to give birth to lightness and triviality; our intention had no such bent. We observed a

⁴Idem: “It is confined to fourteen lines . . . it may as well be fourteen as any other number. . . . Custom is a sufficient reason for it. . . . Rhymes, many or few, or no rhymes at all—whatever the chastity of [the writer’s] ear may prefer. . . .”

resemblance in the manner, and in the sentiments of this triumvirate: a resemblance too close for chance. Mr. Coleridge, for instance, is very fond of the rhyme *ess* or *ness*; as *distress*, *happiness*, &c. &c. and his friends have been very prodigal in this way. We meet with "*quietness*" without end, in the poems before us, especially in those by Mr. Lloyd; and there is, sometimes, both in him and Mr. Lamb, a turgescence of style not very remote from affectation.

It would be a characteristic act for Coleridge to join the outcry against his own volume, i. e. against Coleridge, Lamb, and Lloyd and against that resemblance in manner and sentiments which seemed too close for chance—or for comfort. The plot is further thickened by the fact that before the Higginbottom sonnets appeared, around the first of December, the *Anti-Jacobin Review* had begun a political and parodistic attack on the manner and sentiments of the "Jacobin Poets of the NEW SCHOOL."

We do not know just when Coleridge wrote his parodies. It is technically possible for him to have written and submitted them to the *Monthly Magazine* after reading the attack in the first *Anti-Jacobin*, published November 20. And it is very possible for an aggrieved victim of the first attack, namely Southey, to have supposed himself also the intended butt of the second. A supposition that Coleridge had joined the hue and cry against his former pantisocratic brother would easily be strengthened by the ensuing parodies of Southey in the *Anti-Jacobin*; these appeared even as the conviction was spreading in the minds of Lloyd and Lamb.⁵

Here is the sequence of parody and attack: September, the *Monthly Visitor* defines, not unsympathetically, a "Coleridgean school" including Lamb and Lloyd but not Southey. November 20, the *Anti-Jacobin*, or *Weekly Examiner* undertakes the task of "exposing and chastising malignity" or "Jacobinism" and defines, abusively, the "Jacobin Poets of the NEW SCHOOL," especially singling out Southey with a parody of his verse "Inscriptions." November 27, the *Anti-Jacobin* bears down on the "Sonnets and Elegies" of "the same Author" and parodies his "Sapphics" with "The Friend of Humanity and the Knife-Grinder." At the end of the month appears the *Monthly Magazine* with Nehemiah Higginbottom's three sonnets in parody of the manner of "Contemporary Writers." December 11 and 18, the *Anti-Jacobin* continues with more parodies of Southey,

⁵ The date of Lamb's answer to the effect that Coleridge's denial "was a lie too gross for the grossest ignorance to believe" (*CL*, I, 404) is not known exactly; it must have been at least as late as the second week in December.

including (December 18) the lines beginning, "Wearisome Sonnet-
teer, feeble and querulous," possibly inspired, at least in the epithet,
by Higginbottom's sonnet parodies. In a footnote there is a quiz of
Coleridge as "my worthy friend, the Bellman," i. e. the Watchman.
Whatever innocence there had been in Coleridge's intentions, Southey
and others were not entirely mistaken in assessing the public effect of
the Higginbottom attack as anti-Southeyan. Ultimately, as is of
course well known, the *Anti-Jacobin* moved Coleridge's name even
above Southey's on its list,

C——dge and S—th-y, L——d, and L—be and Co.

thus defining its "Jacobin Bards" as a Coleridgean School after
all.⁶ But it is time we turned directly to the "tissue of the style"
of Coleridge's three mock sonnets to discover, if we can, just which
contemporary manner or manners they do most nearly ridicule.

Sonnet I ("Pensive, at eve, on the hard world I mus'd") "had
for its object," according to the *Biographia*, "to excite a good-natured
laugh at the spirit of doleful egotism and at the recurrence of
favourite phrases, with the double defect of being at once trite and
licentious." This Lawrence Hanson calls "a hit at Lloyd" (*Life of
Coleridge*, p. 215). While the egotism may be Lloyd's—or any
"lonely" sonneteer's—the tissue of favorite phrases is not especially
so: what Coleridge said of the third sonnet can be said accurately
of this one, that it is made up of language and imagery almost en-
tirely from his own poems. The Coleridge concordance reveals that
all the following terms had already been employed in his verse, exactly
or approximately: "pensive at eve" ("at eve with pensive look"),
"hard world," "my poor heart," "tearful," "tearful vacancy" (cf.
"vacant tears"), "glitter'd," "paly," "the black heath," "breezy,"
"inexplicable," and "swell"; and "pause thee" (if not "I did pause
me"), "mus'd" (if not "mus'd me"), and "wretched" (creatures
of various kinds if not "wretched ones").

The adjectives "*dampy*" (italicized for special mirth) and "sooth"

⁶ July 9, 1798. William Haller, *The Early Life of Robert Southey* (1917),
p. 232, like most persons who have written about the *Anti-Jacobin* parodies,
is acquainted only with collections of "The Poetry of the Anti-Jacobin" or
abridged editions of the original magazine; he thus assumes there were no
references to Southey and no additions to the "new school" between December
18 and July 9. But in the prose parts of the original *Anti-Jacobin* Southey
is pilloried on February 5, February 27, and April 9, twice with indirect
allusions to Coleridge, and Holcroft is added to the "school."

(spelled "soothe" in *Biog. Lit.*), never used by Coleridge, were presumably the sins of others, but I do not find them in the verse of Lloyd, or Southey. Lamb, however, had used "sooth" and had probably supplied Higginbottom's clue by having asked Coleridge in a letter whether he thought the word too "quaint" (Lamb, *Letters*, I, 77-78). Southey had, in 1792, written "calmy"; Lamb had more recently tried "shelly"; and Lamb, Lloyd, and Coleridge himself had used "paly" (italicized in *Biog. Lit.*); so "dampy" is probably an invention to outdo these.⁷

In reprinting this first sonnet in *Biographia Literaria* Coleridge underlined and doubly underlined (for italics and small capitals) sixteen words or phrases. Originally the only italics appeared in "dampy" and in the line,

But much of *one* thing is for no thing good,

which affords an example of "flat lines forced into poetry by italics" but is closer to Coleridge's

That all bestowing, *this* withholding all,

in his *Monody on the Death of Chatterton*, than to anything in Lamb, Lloyd, or Southey. Lloyd did grow addicted to the dramatic use of italics in verse he published *after* Higginbottom; Lamb and Southey in this respect had always been more conservative than Coleridge.

Originally the only other emphasis supplied was that of solid capitals for SORROW, MYSELF, and SPIRIT, to bring out the doleful egotism. Actually the central "lonely feeling" of the poem derives from Coleridge's own *Monody on the Death of Chatterton*, not a sonnet but the single most obvious butt of his burlesque (though some of its favourite phrases were also recurrent in "Lines written at the King's Arms, Ross," and other early Coleridge). The *Monody* begins (in the 1794, 1796, and 1797 versions):

When faint and sad o'er Sorrow's desert wild
Slow journeys onward, poor Misfortune's child,

and informs us that both Chatterton and the author are Misfortune's "sad" children journeying over the desert of Sorrow, i. e. "the black Heath of Distress" (to use language recurrent in Coleridge's sonnet

⁷ "Calmy," a Spenserian word, appears in Coleridge's Gutch notebook, ca. 1795-96, in a passage written for Southey's *Joan of Arc* (1796); but when Coleridge retrieved the passage for his own "Destiny of Nations" the word was changed to "calmest." See *PW*, I, 142n. and Kathleen Coburn, ed., *The Notebooks of Samuel Taylor Coleridge* (1957), I, 55 & n.

to Godwin). Chatterton was wont to rove like a star-beam "lone-glittering" and occasionally to "pause abrupt—and gaze" at river water; Coleridge, while musing over Poor Chatterton, catches himself approaching dangerously similar confrontations. In the parody Nehemiah has the same absorption in his own woes, but he gazes at water in a safer location:

Mine eye perus'd
With tearful vacancy, the *dampy* grass
Which wept and glitter'd in the paly ray:
And I did pause me on my lonely way,
And mus'd me on those wretched ones, who pass
O'er the black heath of SORROW. But, alas!
Most of MYSELF I thought.

The sonnet concludes in the action of the *Monody* though not in its language. "Ah! my poor heart's inexplicable swell!" recalls, however, the "dim inexplicable sympathies Disquieting the heart" in Coleridge's *Destiny of Nations*.

The first sonnet, then, as Coleridge almost forgot, was a mockery, not primarily of anybody's sonnets, but of the intensely melancholy and nearly suicidal brooding recurrent in several of his own early poems, especially his *Chatterton*, the most personally anxious of them—for both he and Wordsworth were wont to measure their own powers of poetic endurance anxiously against the example of the marvellous Boy that perished in his pride. The parody touched Charles Lloyd only in so far as he was another poet subject to such despondency, and one accustomed to write about himself, if not precisely in the "manner" parodied here.

Sonnet II. To Simplicity ridicules, according to the *Biographia*, the use of "low, creeping language and thoughts under the pretence of *simplicity*." It is usually taken as a parody of Lamb, though Southey "recognized" it as an attack upon his own style. Coleridge's response sounds like genuine surprise: "how you could apply to yourself a Sonnet written to ridicule infantine simplicity, vulgar colloquialisms, and ladylike Friendships—I have no conception. Neither I believe could a passage in your writings have suggested to me or any man the notion of *your* 'plaining plaintively'" (CL I 359).

The second sonnet is less parody than satiric accusation. It pictures the contemporary writer as preferring lays of "lulling simplicity," as indulging in petty sadness tho' he knows "not why" (while ambling "on Lady Fortune's gentlest pad"), and as soothing his

"dreamy bosom's mystic woes" "with sonnets and with sympathy" while "plaining plaintively" of his "false friend" or "raving at mankind in general"—all for the love of "meek *Simplicity*!" Coleridge, thinking rather less about the poetry than the man, was so absorbed in hitting-off the spiteful, self-indulgent and Fortune-favored rich young man Charles Lloyd that it never occurred to him, we can well believe, that the still struggling Southey, because forsooth he had advocated and practiced some simplicity of style, would apply this description to himself. Southey had identified himself with "Simplicity" in his *Hymn to the Penates* (1796). Southey, offended, professed he was "aware of the danger of studying simplicity of language." But he should have seen that this sonnet does not satirize his kind of poetic simplicity. And Coleridge was right that the central point, the plaintiveness, is not a Southeyan characteristic.

To anyone familiar with the poetry of Lloyd the portrait is easily recognizable even though there are few foci of direct parody. Lloyd's *The Melancholy Man* and his first *Poetical Effusion* contain the typical ingredients. In the *Effusion* his visionary soul seeks sensations to "warm my heart," which it will take "many a mystic thrill" to "sooth or satisfy." Such "dreams of hallow'd import" are needed to heal the "bosom chill" of one suffering from "unrequited friendship" or moved "to curse mankind." Lloyd's heart feels "achings of vacancy." The goddess he hails, in one poem, is *SUBLIMITY*, not *SIMPLICITY*—but in another he announces himself "a plain and simple man." And he has a line beginning "'Tis simple!" which may be the clue to Higginbottom's conclusion:

. . . 'tis simple all,
All very simple, meek *SIMPLICITY*!

The poet's soothing his woes "with sonnets and with sympathy" might be taken as an allusion to evenings with Lamb. Writing to Coleridge on December 10, 1796, Lamb had alluded somewhat disparagingly to the time "when you were repeating one of Bowles's sweetest sonnets in your sweet manner, while we two were indulging sympathy, a solitary luxury, by the fireside at the Salutation." This letter, which Coleridge kept, may be looked upon as a "source" for the parody. But Lamb is only marginally in the picture even so. The theme of lost friendship is treated by Lamb, in his *Sonnet IV* and elsewhere, with more nostalgia and less acerbity than by Lloyd or Nehemiah. The "puny pathos" of Higginbottom's

So sad I am!—but should a friend and I
Grow cool and miff, O! I am very sad!

could apply, personally speaking, to Lloyd (or Southey) but not to Lamb—though it may echo Lamb's "and oh! most sad" as well as the line,

I weep that heaven-born Genius so should fall,

in Coleridge's own *Monody on Chatterton*.

It may be that the bathos of "miff" and "pad" were suggested by such things as Lloyd's vow, in his *Sonnet VI*, not to let a "scowl" on his face "blab to the elements" his "puny care," though "miff" is a joke, like "dampy," and not a word really used by any of these writers. In sheer monstrosity of bathos Coleridge, of course, had outdone them all in his *Monologue to a Young Jack Ass in Jesus Piece*, a poem signed in the newspaper not pseudonymously but with his proper name. *To Simplicity*, however, strikes so directly at Lloyd that it is difficult to imagine what kind of evidence Lloyd used to persuade his friends that Nehemiah's butt was Southey. Perhaps he put it "Southey and myself," though that is not indicated in the correspondence.

How much Coleridge may have been influenced to rail against Simplicity by the fact that he himself had recently been charged with shunning it is a fascinating question. In the *Critical Review* of July 1797 his *Ode on the Departing Year* was described as mistaking "bombast and obscurity for sublimity" and, despite "some nervous lines," as generally "shunning that simplicity which should for ever accompany the lyric Muse."⁸

Sonnet III. On a Ruined House in a Romantic Country (i.e. the House that Jack Built) was directed against "the indiscriminate use of elaborate and swelling language and imagery," said Coleridge.⁹ He professed to be ridiculing only himself here, accepting, as it were, the charge just quoted from the *Critical Review*. Yet analysis of the

⁸ Coleridge himself had hailed "Th'unweeting triumph of simplicity!" in a maid "devoid of guile"—in "Absence: A Poem" in the *Weekly Entertainer* of 1793 (recently noted by Robert Mayo). He deleted the line, however, when revising "Absence" as "Lines in Autumn."

Much later he defined the poet as grounded in simplicity: "The poet is one who carries the simplicity of childhood into the powers of manhood" (*Shakespearean Criticism*, II, 148; cf. *Biog. Lit.*, I, 59, and the *Friend*, p. 65—all cited in René Wellek, *A History of Modern Criticism* ([1955], II, 392).

⁹ In 1815 Coleridge recalled that it was his poetry's "obscurity, false splendour, and bucksome [buckram?] diction" that he had ridiculed "in the third of 'the Sonnets by Nehemiah Higginbotham'" (*Unpublished Letters*, II, 135).

public buffoonery of this third sonnet recovers within it a tour de force of private jest, the depths of which perhaps only Coleridge's new companion Wordsworth can have fully recognized. The sonnet is indeed made up of swelling language and imagery, but Coleridge's assertion that these were "borrowed entirely from my own poems" can be defended only as a legal fiction.

The assertion is half true. "Reft house" is from Coleridge's *Lines Written at Shurton Bars*. The rats that squeak "not unconscious of their father's guilt" are both mimic and symbolic archetypes of the children contemplated by the soul "not unconscious that she dreamt" in the *Sonnet* written by Coleridge as a father "having received intelligence of the birth of a son." The italicized "*aye*" and "*erst*" are recognizable Coleridgean clichés. The "tatter'd" brogues go with his earlier "tatter'd vest" and "tatter'd pall." The "full-orb'd harvest-moon" is the "full-orb'd Queen" of his *To the Nightingale*. Yet the title suggests the new but unpublished "Ruined Cottage" of Wordsworth. And although this proves to be a false lead (as does the possibility of an allusion to "The Decayed Farm-House" in *Poems* by Robert Lovell and Robert Southey), the modern publication of Wordsworth and Coleridge manuscripts permits us to discover, behind the two major images of this parody—the "gleaming" of the maiden all forlorn and the peeping of the charms of her "amorous knight"—a surreptitious not to say cheeky use of another unpublished poem of Wordsworth's.

The idea of a ghostly maiden who haunts a wonted glade and is seen "gleaming" in the moonlight, by her earthly or "unearthly" lover, was of course a widely abused romantic theme. Coleridge in *An Effusion at Evening* confessed to fanciful trysts with an "absent Maiden" who appeared "glancing in the gleams of Dawn" and clad in moonbeams amid the "paly" radiance of the night-dew. (Perhaps the "bent Flower" which "weeps" beneath this dew is related to the "dampy grass Which wept" in *Sonnet I*.) Coleridge reworked this Effusion for his *Poems* of 1796, and it was perhaps in his mind when, as Higginbottom, he asked:

Did ye not see her gleaming thro' the glade!
Belike, 'twas she, the maiden all forlorn . . .
Yet, *aye*, she haunts the dale where *erst* she stray'd:
And, *aye*, beside her stalks her amorous knight!

Perhaps also in his mind was his recently finished *Osorio*; in it occur

an "unearthly smile" and, for the first time in Coleridge's verse, the words "knight" and "stalked." Much stronger parallels are to be found, however, in *Lewti; or the Circassian's Love-chant*, a poem which Coleridge would publish in the *Morning Post* April 13, 1798, after at least four successive revisions.

The first of these, as we now know, was simply an almost unchanged transcription of a "Fragment" in Wordsworth's notebook called *Beauty and Moonlight An Ode*. In this *Ode*, written by Wordsworth ten years earlier, and in Coleridge's first two drafts of *Lewti*, the moonlight playing on a bright rock amid "boughs of tressy yew" makes the lover think he sees his Mary (or Lewti) "Gleaming through her sable hair." Then in the high heaven he sees the moon (with "paly beam," by the way, an epithet that may have drawn Coleridge's thought to this poem after he had laughed at "paly ray" in the first Higginbottom sonnet). The moon is "peeping" below "a black-arched cloud" (which Coleridge changes in his second draft to "a cloud of whitest hue"). The lover then sees in the surf the white waves "twinkling regular and white" like the "white and regular" teeth in Lewti's "smiling mouth," and, finally, two swans which make him wish to see "her bosom soft and white Heave upon my swimming sight."

Both "paly" and "peeping," ridiculed by Higginbottom, are eliminated in the second draft of *Lewti*. On the other hand, perhaps in the spirit that anything goes in newspaper verse, the white hallucinatory charms, the white teeth and white heaving breasts, are elaborated in the *Morning Post* version, where the lover is also given a cheek "white" as the cloud.

In the Higginbottom version, parodying what is his own work in the sense that Wordsworth has now given it to him, Coleridge gives vent to his appreciation of the extravagance of the whole business and reduces it to scatological absurdity, transferring the white charms from the gleaming maiden to her pallid knight:

Still on his thighs their wonted brogues are worn,
And thro' those brogues, still tatter'd and betorn,
His hindward charms gleam an unearthly white;
As when thro' broken clouds at night's high noon
Peeps in fair fragments forth the full-orb'd harvest-moon!

Wordsworth, as we know, gave several of his juvenilia to Coleridge to make what use he could of them to fulfill his weekly obligation to the *Morning Post*. This parody of a Wordsworthian poem in the

Higginbottom sonnet published at the end of November 1797 is valuable evidence that such collaboration or ghost writing had begun almost as soon as Coleridge had accepted the idea of writing for the *Post* (see Mackintosh's letter of November 17 in *CL*, I, 359). It had begun, however, only in the sense that Coleridge had begun looking into Wordsworth's notebook. For, as Professor Raysor has recently pointed out,¹⁰ Coleridge's revisions of *Lewti*, beyond the mere transcription, were not made until after December 7, when he received from Cottle the blank notebook in which some parallel offshoots of *Lewti* in revision appear.

The date established by the Higginbottom parody supports the valuable hypothesis that before the Wordsworths went to London in late November or early December Coleridge had been given permission—or at least an opportunity—to plunder Wordsworth's notebook. An interesting consequent probability is that Wordsworth's *The Convict*, published pseudonymously in the *Morning Post* December 14 but announced by the editor on December 9, was not contributed directly by Wordsworth himself but was sent in as his friend's third contribution for his weekly guinea. An examination of the Coleridgean revisions in the newspaper version of *The Convict* is something for another note.

New York Public Library

DAVID V. ERDMAN

James's *Madame de Mauves* and Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter*

In *American Renaissance* (New York, 1941), p. 298, F. O. Matthiessen said that James's technical development was partly a direct response to his sense of Hawthorne's limitations, particularly his use of allegory and what James called "a certain superficial symbolism."¹ In James's short novel, *Madame de Mauves*, we are afforded an opportunity to study not only some interesting general similarities to *The Scarlet Letter* but also (1) James's implicit criticism of Hawthorne's allegorical method, (2) James's unusual use of that method in Longmore's dream in the forest, and (3) the relationship between James's

¹⁰ *Philological Quarterly*, XXXII (1953), 207-210.

¹ *Hawthorne* (London and New York, 1879), p. 114.

own presentation of certain scenes in *Madame de Mauves* and his explicit criticism (in his critical study, *Hawthorne*) of similar scenes in *The Scarlet Letter*. James, of course, thought Hawthorne's book a great novel, and it is a tribute to his critical acumen that he could learn both from that greatness and from the few flaws he detected.

The general similarities between the two novels should not, of course, be pressed too far. I note them here merely to show that part of the structure and some scenes and situations in *The Scarlet Letter* impressed James strongly enough to persist vividly in his memory through the writing of *Madame de Mauves* in 1873. At first glance, indeed, the two novels are strikingly dissimilar. Yet upon further examination it is possible to note a curious inversion in character and situation that throws into bold relief the basic, if odd, kinship between Hester Prynne and Euphemia de Mauves. Hester, from a small village in England, comes to America, where she sins; Euphemia, from New York, comes via a Parisian convent to Auvergne and Saint-Germain, where she remains "innocent" in the world of her husband's profligacy. Dimmesdale and Hester have the opportunity of escaping the scene of their sin, Salem, which is ironically the core of militant Puritan morality; Longmore and Euphemia, both "innocent," can escape from a corrupt world to the world of Puritan morality, to what Longmore calls "a society possibly rather provincial, but . . . [with] a good deal of solid virtue; jealousies and vanities very tame, and no particular iniquities and adulteries."² Both Hester and Euphemia, however, choose finally to live with their new worlds. In each novel, moreover, the husband figure is insidious, Chillingworth the diabolic torturer of Dimmesdale, M. de Mauves the devil's advocate who offers his wife to Longmore.

Both women ultimately come to live in isolation, each in a place representing a kind of compromise between "civilization" (Salem and Paris) and a world of "innocence," free, natural, uncorrupted, fresh.³ In both cases the retreat to innocence is made only tentatively, is ultimately seen to be impossible, and both women, still isolated but having triumphed over their worlds of sordid experience, carry around within them the secrets of their own special sorrows. Euphemia, as we first meet her at Saint-Germain, rarely leaves her pavilion "except

² *Madame de Mauves*, in *A Passionate Pilgrim and Other Tales* (Boston, 1875), p. 439. Page references in the text will be to this edition. Page references to *The Scarlet Letter* will be to the Rinehart ed. (New York, 1947).

³ The forest and sea in *The Scarlet Letter*, the forest beyond the "excessively artificial garden" in *Madame de Mauves*. Cf. Longmore's reaction to Madame Clairin, pp. 404-405.

to drive or walk in the forest" (397). When asked by Longmore why she remains in France, "if she were not oppressed with a sense of irreconcilable difference from 'all these people,'" Euphemia answers: "I almost grew up here . . . and it was here for me that those dreams of the future took shape that we all have when we cease to be very young. As matters stand, one may be very American and yet arrange it with one's own conscience to live in Europe. . . . This is not America, perhaps, about me, but it's quite as little France. France is out there, beyond the garden, in the town, in the forest; but here, close about me, in my room and . . . in my mind, it's a nameless country of my own. It's not her country . . . that makes a woman happy or unhappy" (401). So too Hester lives in her country of the mind at the edge of the forest; and Hawthorne comments at length in a passage which surely James recalled when writing of Isabel Archer's return to Osmond as well as Euphemia's insistence on remaining with her husband:

It may seem marvellous, that, with the world before her,—kept by no restrictive clause of her condemnation within the limits of the Puritan settlement, so remote and so obscure,—free to return to her birthplace, or to any other European land, and there hide her character and identity under a new exterior, as completely as if emerging into another state of being,—and having also the passes of the dark, inscrutable forest open to her . . . —it may seem marvellous that this woman should still call that place her home. . . . *But there is a fatality, a feeling so irresistible and inevitable that it has the force of doom, which almost invariably compels human beings to linger around and haunt . . . the spot where some great and marked event has given color to their lifetime; and still the more irresistibly, the darker the tinge that saddens it* [my italics]. Her sin, her ignominy, were the roots which she had struck into the soil. . . . All other scenes of earth—even that village of rural England, where happy infancy and stainless maidenhood seemed yet to be in her mother's keeping, like garments put off long ago—were foreign to her, in comparison. The charm that bound her here was of iron links, and galling to her inmost soul, but could never be broken (74).

In addition to this condition of physical and moral isolation in both novels, the roles of Chillingworth and M. de Mauves, as I have said, are at least distantly similar; and the net effects of their respective villainy are identical: Longmore refuses to capitulate to the Baron's standards of morality and leaves Euphemia, while Hester and Dimmesdale cheat Chillingworth's revenge by exposing themselves on the scaffold. Deprived of their triumphs both antagonists waste away. Chillingworth's "strength and energy—all his vital and intellectual force—seemed at once to desert him; insomuch that he positively

withered up, shrivelled away, and almost vanished from mortal sight, like an uprooted weed that lies wilting in the sun" (247). M. de Mauves "gave up society, ceased to care for anything, looked shockingly" (496).

Finally, both authors are at least partly concerned with the thematic dichotomy between appearance and reality, hypocrisy and truth, essential and apparent character. In *Madame de Mauves*, for example, the Baron's mother advises Euphemia, "Whatever befalls you, promise me this: to be yourself. . . . Yourself, understand, in spite of everything,—bad precepts and bad examples, bad usage even. Be persistently and patiently yourself . . ." (392). And, after the final scaffold scene in *The Scarlet Letter*, in which Dimmesdale uncovers his own stigma, Hawthorne comments: "Among many morals which press upon us from the poor minister's miserable experience, we put only this into a sentence: 'Be true! Be true! Be true!'" (247).⁴

These general similarities are interesting in and for themselves, but they also argue for a possible closer relationship between the two books, between Hawthorne's fictional technique, as James understood it, and James's own art. Structurally the two novels are strikingly comparable. Just as in *The Scarlet Letter* three main scenes (Hester with Chillingworth on the peninsula shore, Hester with Pearl in the forest, Hester and Pearl with Dimmesdale in the forest) occupy key positions in the series of tableaux which help to give the novel its formal, symmetrical structure, so in *Madame de Mauves* a sequence of four scenes, all in the forest (an unusual setting for James), chart formally the development of the relationship between Longmore and Euphemia and the former's growing awareness of the full strength of character shown by the latter in her relationship with M. de Mauves. In the first of James's scenes, which takes place at a fallen log on the forest path, Longmore first tries to probe the causes of Euphemia's sorrow. In a sense this is parallel to the scene in which Pearl questions Hester about the significance of the scarlet letter. In the second scene, by the same fallen log, Longmore has just returned from Paris where he discovered M. de Mauves in a cafe with another woman; he tries to tempt Euphemia with a vision of a better, if more provincial, life (see the passage quoted earlier). Similarly Dimmesdale and Hester, meeting in the forest, envision a new life abroad and contemplate their escape on the ship recently anchored in the harbor. In James's third

⁴ See also, in *Madame de Mauves*, p. 479, and in *The Scarlet Letter*, pp. 202, 242.

forest scene Longmore, escaping from M. de Mauves' offer of his wife (delivered by Madame Clairin), moves alone through the forest to the world beyond, a world of pastoral simplicity, idyllic, romantic, natural (459), the same world of escape, of life on "possible terms,"⁸ which the forest and sea represent for Dimmesdale and Hester.

The fourth and final forest scene in *Madame de Mauves* is Longmore's dream of Euphemia, presented in precisely the same terms as the brookside scene in *The Scarlet Letter*. In these two scenes both James and Hawthorne foreshadow allegorically the final destruction of the illusory freedom, innocence, and escape which Nature seems to offer. Typically Hawthorne builds his scene into a rich tapestry of brilliant sunshine and ominous shade; with the stream of life dividing the world of the scarlet letter from a sinless world; with Pearl herself divided between her symbolic reality and her elfin image in the stream; with the green leaves of life overarching the scene and the fallen, dead leaves on the path underfoot, the path to the village as opposed to the inviting, open, bright "pathway of the sea." Even without the tapestry Hawthorne's basic point is clear: Pearl refuses to accept the illusion of freedom represented by Hester's letting down her hair and throwing away the scarlet letter; and she refuses to cross the stream (which James calls a "kind of spiritual gulf"), just as she refuses to kiss Dimmesdale or hold his hand until the final assertion of truth and reality on the scaffold at the end of the novel.

As Matthiessen has said (p. 301), Hawthorne often seemed to start "with a dominant moral idea, for which his picture, like Spenser's, was to be an illustration," while James, on the other hand, "seized first upon a dramatic image." In *Madame de Mauves* we might point to M. de Mauves' intrusion upon Longmore and Euphemia in the forest as an example of such an image. "Hawthorne's imagination," as James himself put it (*Hawthorne*, pp. 62-63), "plays with his theme so incessantly, leads it such a dance through the moonlighted air of his intellect, that the thing cools off, as it were, hardens and stiffens, and, producing effects much more exquisite, leaves the reader with a sense of having handled a splendid piece of silversmith's work." James generally eschews such a "dance" and builds his

⁸ The phrase is Longmore's (p. 460), but the idea is clearly present in both novels—contrasted with the inability of man to create a world which is better, more wholesome, more happy than the one which actually exists. As Euphemia says at one point, "Visions are vain things; we must make the best of reality" (439). And Hawthorne comments at the end of his novel: "But there was a more real life for Hester Prynne here, in New England, than in that unknown region where Pearl had found a home" (250).

effects, instead, in terms of dynamic human relationships, for which the natural scene is the dramatic setting and not a group of counters to be moved about in allegorical conflict. Implicit, then, in James's restraint in all four of the forest scenes in *Madame de Mauves* is his awareness of what he believed to be the limitations of Hawthorne's method. "Allegory, to my sense," he wrote, "is quite one of the lighter exercises of the imagination. . . . It is apt to spoil two good things—a story and a moral, a meaning and a form. . . . The only cases in which it is endurable is when it is extremely spontaneous, when the analogy presents itself with eager promptitude. When it shows signs of having been groped and fumbled for, the needful illusion is of course absent and the end to which it operates becomes a matter of indifference" (*Hawthorne*, p. 63).

Of the few faults he found in *The Scarlet Letter* James felt one to be "a want of reality and an abuse of the fanciful element"; and he singles out the brookside scene to illustrate his point. He objects strongly to the heavy allegorical meaning Hawthorne heaps upon the simple scene, which James surely considered eloquent in itself: "This conception belongs . . . quite to the lighter order of a story-teller's devices, and the reader hardly goes along with Hawthorne in the large development he gives to it" (*Hawthorne*, p. 119). Thus when James himself uses Hawthorne's dividing stream in *Madame de Mauves*, with suitable transformations of course, its context is a dream. This first of all provides James a kind of protection from his own criticism; but also the dream device helps to make the allegory seem "spontaneous," to present itself to Longmore's mind with "eager promptitude," and to create the "needful illusion." Unlike Hawthorne, then, who in a similar scene tries to make the real allegorical, James in a sense tries to make the allegorical real; and his final comment on the dream, through Longmore's thoughts, is his clear judgment on the use of the device in the first place. I quote Longmore's dream at length:

He seemed to be in a wood, very much like the one on which his eyes had lately closed; but the wood was divided by the murmuring stream he had left an hour before. He was walking up and down, he thought, restlessly and in intense expectation of some momentous event. Suddenly, at a distance, through the trees, he saw the gleam of a woman's dress,* and hurried forward

* Note that even in the context of the allegory James begins with a dramatic image, one which is interestingly similar to the finest such image in the novel, of Euphemia as she implores Longmore to make the right decision to leave her (pp. 475-476).

to meet her. As he advanced he recognized her, but he saw at the same time that she was on the opposite bank of the river. . . . She made him no motion that he should cross the stream, but he wished greatly to stand by her side. He knew the water was deep, and . . . he feared that when he rose to the surface she would have disappeared. Nevertheless, he was going to plunge, when a boat turned into the current from above and came swiftly toward them, guided by an oarsman, who was sitting so that they could not see his face. He brought the boat to the bank where Longmore stood; the latter stepped in, and with a few strokes they touched the opposite shore. Longmore got out, and, though he was sure he had crossed the stream, Madame de Mauves was not there. He turned with a kind of agony and saw that now she was on the other bank. . . . She gave him a grave, silent glance, and walked away up the stream. The boat and the boatman resumed their course, but after going a short distance they stopped, and the boatman turned back and looked at the still divided couple. Then Longmore recognized him,—just as he had recognized him a few days before at the cafe in the Bois de Boulogne (468-469).

After waking, Longmore does not remember the dream immediately; and when he does recall it his comment is, in effect, James's comment on the Hawthornesque quality of the whole conception: "No great ingenuity was needed to make it seem a rather striking allegory, and it haunted and oppressed him for the rest of the day" (470). Like Hawthorne's, James's point too is clear. The forest world of freedom, which Longmore reached by penetrating through it to pastoral "innocence," is an illusion, for it is only by means of M. de Mauves' offer that that freedom can be attained. Or, to put it another way, Longmore could never reach the true Euphemia by means of M. de Mauves' boat. Hence in both novels, the renunciation, the sacrifice is a necessary condition to the preservation of good, of reality, of truthfulness, of the dignity and inviolability of the human soul. And to reach this end James makes unusual use of Hawthorne's method: he looks "for images which . . . place themselves in picturesque correspondence with the spiritual facts with which he is concerned"; and then, by means of Longmore's comment, he rescues himself from the limitations of that method—"when the machinery alone is visible" or "when the image becomes importunate" (*Hawthorne*, pp. 119, 63). James, in effect, exposes his own machinery and then paradoxically puts it to work to help him characterize the essentially Puritan mind of Longmore, the mind Euphemia must penetrate and impress if she is to remain herself.

Wayne State University

ROBERT F. GLECKNER

Edith Wharton on Critics and Criticism

This letter revealing Edith Wharton's personal reaction to criticism of her work, was written to Zona Gale in 1922 in Mrs. Wharton's hand and sent from her home near Paris. There may have been correspondence between Miss Gale and Mrs. Wharton previous to this letter, but it seems most probable that it was a direct answer to a letter from Miss Gale written two months earlier, apparently expressing her approval of Mrs. Wharton's work.¹

Oct. 22, 1922

Dear Miss Gale —

When one greatly enjoys and admires a book one always (I find) takes for granted such a community of spirit between the writer and one's self, that one is surprised to find that one's appreciation is a surprise!

This is awkward, but I trust explicit—it means, at any rate: How could you think I hadn't felt the importance of Lulu, supposing you thought at all about my possible opinion of her? I'm always, watchfully and patiently, on the look-out for what the young people are doing, and exulting and triumphing when a Lulu or a Babbitt emerges. The real surprise is that any of you should care about *my* point of view. I thought you all regarded me as the Mrs.—well, fill in a respectable, deceased mid-Victorian name—of America; for having all through my early career been condemned by the reviewers of my native land for “not knowing how to construct” a novel, I am now far more utterly banned by their descendants for “constructing.”

It all comes to the same thing in the end—but the praise of your generation consoled me as nothing else could for having been so long and invariably criticized and approved for the wrong things!

Thank you for your letter—and do come and see me some day, won't you?

Yrs ever sincerely

Edith Wharton

Please suppress the retired Prima Donna in the (appropriately) Opera cloak! This is what I really look like—or did one day during the war, seeing off an American Ambulance.

¹ Zona Gale sent this first letter to Edith Wharton in care of R. B. Jewett of D. Appleton & Co., the publishers of *The Glimpses of the Moon* (July, 1922). Mr. Jewett sent the letter to Mrs. Wharton and she replied to him (29 August 1922), “Many thanks for your letters of August 15th and 18th [1922], with their innumerable enclosures. I would give all the reviews, I mean all the favorable ones, for such a letter as Miss Gale's, not only because I admire her work so much, and consequently value her approval in proportion to my admiration, but also because she has put her finger on the very central nerve of my book. This does not happen more than once or twice, even in a long career.” Mrs. Wharton's letters to Mr. Jewett and Miss Gale are both in the Zona Gale Collection of Lane Library, Ripon College; and are used here with the permission of the library.

After the publication early in the century of her first novels, *The Valley of Decision* and *The House of Mirth*, Edith Wharton immediately became for the critics and reviewers the only new writer from whom a truly great novel could be expected. Unfortunately they found it necessary to qualify their praise in this manner throughout the whole of Mrs. Wharton's career; the expectations were never fulfilled, and today almost every literary critic or historian would agree with Alfred Kazin that ". . . it is curious to remember that she always suggested more distinction than she possessed. . . ." ²

The criticism levelled at Mrs. Wharton during her life is varied, but there is a pattern to the attacks that may justify her bitterness in this letter to Zona Gale concerning her condemnation by the critics first for "not knowing how to construct" a novel and then for "constructing."

After *The House of Mirth* appeared, Henry Dwight Sedgwick wrote, ". . . in a novel no episode can be self-sufficient; it must proceed from the episode before and merge into the episode that follows. In this part of her craft Mrs. Wharton has always shown a certain lack of dexterity. . . ." ³

The "descendants" of her early critics, to whom Mrs. Wharton refers in the letter, were no doubt those who reviewed her novel, *The Glimpses of the Moon*, for this book was published only a few months before her letter to Miss Gale was written, and was harshly criticized by almost every reviewer. Gilbert Seldes, in his review of the novel, wrote that "In her failure to suggest the richness of life, and in the refusal to render the passion of love, Mrs. Wharton has left her work empty. The bowl is chastely proportioned and cunningly wrought; but it brims over with no rich liquor. Instead there is the watered wine of her plot. . . . It is the magic of technique. It is not quite enough." ⁴

The somewhat self-pitying tone of Mrs. Wharton's letter to Zona Gale suggests that her statement about the changed attitude of her critics should not be taken too seriously; however, there is certainly a noticeable alteration in reaction to her work in the reviews from 1902 to 1922. Perhaps Mrs. Wharton's "failure"—that expectations were never fulfilled, that there was merely a suggestion of distinction about her work—was actually due to a confusion of literary values

² *On Native Grounds* (New York, 1956), p. 61.

³ "The Novels of Mrs. Wharton," *Atlantic*, xcvi, 224 (August, 1906).

⁴ "The Altar of the Dead," *The Dial*, lxxiii, 344 (September, 1922).

among the critics of the first quarter of this century concerning technique in the novel.

It is also interesting to note in connection with this letter Mrs. Wharton's comment in 1933 that "If one has sought the publicity of print, and sold one's wares in the open market, one has sold to the purchasers of one's books the right to think what they choose about them; and the novelist's best safeguard is to try to put out of his mind the quality of the praise or blame likely to be meted out to him. . . ." ⁵

State University of Iowa

ERIC LAGUARDIA

The Protagonist of Hemingway's "The Killers"

The theory that Ole Andreson is not the protagonist of Hemingway's by-now classic story, "The Killers," was first suggested by Cleanth Brooks and Robert Penn Warren in 1936. In *An Approach to Literature* they wrote: "The story is apparently about the attempt of two gangsters to kill an ex-prizefighter, but the real center of the story lies in the effect of this attempt on one of the boys in the lunch wagon." And later, in *Understanding Fiction*: "It is Nick's story. And the story is about the discovery of evil. The theme, in a sense, is the Hamlet theme, or the theme of Sherwood Anderson's 'I Want to Know Why.'" This interpretation of the story has now become almost as familiar as the story itself, but it will not be satisfactory to many readers.

If Andreson were the protagonist, Brooks and Warren maintain, there is no reason why the story should not end with Nick's visit to Andreson's room—no reason why Nick should meet the landlady and return to the lunchroom. But there is an obvious reason for both of these incidents: to provide the reader with information without which the Swede's situation would not be nearly so significant. Mrs. Bell's opinion of Andreson's character (which she stresses in three of the four short speeches which Hemingway allows her) serves to increase the reader's sympathy for him, and George's surmise that he "must have got mixed up in something in Chicago" and that he probably

⁵ "Confessions of a Novelist," *Atlantic*, CLI, 392 (April, 1933).

"double crossed somebody" suggests a motive for the gunmen, without which their actions would seem unnecessarily mysterious—particularly since we have learned that they are unacquainted with their intended victim.

Brooks and Warren see the real point of the story revealed in the bit of dialogue with which it closes:

"I'm going to get out of this town," Nick said.

"Yes," said George. "That's a good thing to do."

"I can't stand to think about him waiting in the room and knowing he's going to get it. It's too damned awful."

"Well," said George, "you better not think about it."

A *propos* of these speeches, they write: "So, of the two boys, it is obviously Nick upon whom the impression has been made. George has managed to come to terms with the situation. By this line of reasoning it is Nick's story."

It is a line of reasoning which the reader is not obliged to follow quite so far. In their desire to prove that the central idea of the story is Nick's discovery of evil, Brooks and Warren have exaggerated the difference between Nick and George, seeing in the former a symbol of the world of innocence and in the latter a symbol of the world of experience. There is really nothing in the above-quoted dialogue (or elsewhere in the story) to justify this impression. The whole passage can be interpreted much more simply. It is scarcely surprising that it is Nick and not George upon whom "the impression has been made," since it is Nick and not George who has just witnessed the terrible scene in Andreson's room: the sight of the big Swede lying on his bed in passive acceptance of his fate. Nor is Nick's decision to leave town indicative of any real difference between the two men: George's introduction to it, after all, was doubtless less sensational, besides which he may have ties which make it difficult for him to leave.

Another passage to which these critics have attached a special importance reads: "Nick stood up. He had never had a towel in his mouth before." They claim this as additional evidence of Nick's innocence. But surely the fact that one has never been gagged does not necessarily argue for excessive innocence! (How many people, after all, have been?) "Being gagged," they write, "was something you read about in a thriller and not something which happened to you." It is for this reason, they say, that Hemingway uses the specific word *towel* instead of the more general *gag*: "The towel is sanctified in

the thriller as the gag, and here that cliché has come true." But it is scarcely necessary to resort to such recondite reasons to explain the preference of *towel* to *gag*: apart from the sensory advantages of the former (which they admit), it must not be forgotten that the gagging takes place in a *kitchen*.

There is a very simple reason why Nick cannot be the protagonist: we do not know enough about him. Indeed, all that we know of his history is that he has never been gagged. On the other hand, Hemingway has been at some pains to inform us of Andreson's appearance, character, and background. We can *visualize* the Swede, and his problem interests us because we know something about him. Nick has no particular reality for the reader. There is no reason why he should have, since he is merely an instrument for registering the emotions of pity and terror inspired by the sight of a strong man lying helpless on his bed. This is Nick's proper function in "The Killers," as a *device*, and the fact that Hemingway chooses to communicate these emotions to the reader *via* Nick does not make it any the less Andreson's story.

University of Illinois

OLIVER EVANS

The Grail in the *Parcevals* Saga

In his treatise "Ueber die französischen Gralromane" (*Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Classe*, vol. 40, Nr. 3, Vienna, 1892), Richard Heinzel advanced an ingenious theory about the meaning of the curious passage in the *Parcevals* saga which presumably describes the Grail,

þvi næst gek inn ein fogr mæ ok bar i hondum sér þvi líkast sem textus væri enn þeir i völsku máli kalla braull enn vær megu kalla ganganda greiða.¹

Heinzel (p. 6 f.) explained the tripartite description of the strange object which most nearly resembled *textus*, which was in French called

¹ Here quoted from a photostatic copy of page 49a of the unique medieval manuscript, Cod. isl. perg. 4to, Nr. 6, preserved in the Royal Library in Stockholm. Contractions have been expanded, but diacritical marks have not been added. A normalized text is printed by Eugen Kölbing in *Riddarasögur*, Strassburg, 1872.

braull, and which might be called *ganganda greiða* in Old Norse as follows:

1. *Textus* was taken to be "ungefähr soviel als *gradale*" and a definition to which the Old Norse translator came after having made enquiry what OF *graal* (taken out of context) meant, and having been informed that it was an antiphonary.

2. *Braull* was considered a scribal error.

3. *Gangandi greiði* was supposed to mean "gehende Bewirtung" and to indicate a second translation of OF *graal* (a homonym of *gradale*, *graal*, "antiphonary") in the sense of "chalice."

Heinzel implied that the translator, unfamiliar with the word or concept *graal*, gave alternative meanings as possible identifications of the unknown object. His theory has seemed plausible to several scholars and has been accepted among others by Wolfgang Golther in *Parzifal und der Graal*, Stuttgart, 1925, and J. Fourquet in *Wolfram d'Eschenbach et le Conte del Graal*, Strasbourg, 1938. On closer inspection, however, the theory becomes untenable.

Textus denotes not an antiphonary but a book of the Gospels (as Heinzel was of course aware).² As such it could be accorded the reverence connoted by the descriptive remark which follows the disputed passage: þat var giort með miklum hagleik af gulli og allum dyrstum steinum er i varu verollidunni. There is no reason to assume that a Christian in the later Middle Ages would confound the two ecclesiastical books. If *graal* was interpreted as *gradalis*, OF *grael* (variant spellings listed by Godefroy, *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française*, include *graal*, *greel*, *greé*, *greil*, and *gradal*), there was no linguistic reason for using *textus*. The Old Norse form of the word was *gradal*, *graðall* (later popular form, *grallari*). What is more, the Latin, ecclesiastical term *textus* is of rare occurrence in Old Norse; the derivative form *texti* is the more usual.

Since the French text on which the saga apparently is based, Chrétien's *Perceval le Gallois*,³ called the object *Graal* or *Grael*, the equation of *graal* and *braull* (or **graul*) seems justifiable. The error in transmission of the term could indicate merely that it was an unknown quantity to the translator or scribe or both. *Braull* (or **graul*) does not appear elsewhere in Old Norse; nor is there any

² Heinzel's statement, p. 7, "so ist *textus* ungefähr soviel als *gradale*, *Evangelienbuch*" is confusing and may be a misprint.

³ As demonstrated by Kölbing in "Die nordische Parzivalsaga und ihre Quelle," *Germania* xiv, 1869, pp. 129 ff.

ON **brall* (or **grall*) which might have misled a scribe. The form *braull* is nevertheless troublesome. As Roger S. Loomis has pointed out,⁴ initial *B/b* and *G* can easily be confused in some medieval and early modern scripts. A scribe may have misread a *G* for a *B* or *b*. It is also possible that we may be misreading a *G* for a *b* in the manuscript. Kölbing, who prints the word as *braull* in his text, substitutes the form *graull* in his "Berichtigungen." The photostatic copy of the manuscript page before me is not conclusive, although the word as it stands must be read *braull*. The parchment has suffered some damage by moisture, chemical action, or erasure, and an initial *G* may conceivably have lost the mark which would distinguish it from *b* in the script employed. Dr. Ole Widding has been so kind as to examine both the photostatic copy and the Stockholm manuscript; he concludes that the initial letter is a *b*, although he notes a hairline that transects the upper half of the vertical line of the letter which otherwise resembles *b* as that letter appears elsewhere in the manuscript. There are two seventeenth-century copies of the Stockholm manuscript, AM 179 fol. and AM 181A fol. In both copies, the word is to be read as *braull* (or *Braull*), although the initial letter of *Braull* in AM 181A does resemble a *G*. The source and significance of the -*u*- in *braull* is a moot point.

There is no evidence that *gangandi greiði* should have the meaning which Heinzel attributes to it as a description of *graal* in the sense "sorte de vase" (Godefroy). As far as can be established with the aid of the material which has been assembled for the Old Norse-Icelandic dictionary now in progress in Copenhagen under the direction of Dr. Widding, the phrase does not occur elsewhere. Nor does *greiði* elsewhere have the concrete sense required by Heinzel's translation. Nor is "hospitality" the primary or common meaning of *greiði*. Curiously enough, the phrase *gangandi greiði* does occur at least once in modern Icelandic. Sigfús Blöndal, *Íslandsk-dansk Ordbog*, refers under *greiði* to a letter from Jón Sigurðsson (written May 27, 1874) which contains the passage, "hann lofaði að vera einskonar gángandi greiði í íslenskri og danskri literatur, lesa hér yfir ísl. literatur og á Íslandi yfir danskri literatur. . . ." Here the phrase is used in the sense of intermediary, or "walking dictionary"—to use a colloquial expression. It is not improbable that Jón had the *Parcevals* saga in mind when he—perhaps humorously—employed the enigmatic

⁴ "Malory's Beaumains," *PMLA* LIV, 1939, p. 659.

phrase. The editor of the modern Icelandic dictionary now in progress in Reykjavik, Mr. Jacob Benediktsson, has kindly informed me that *gangandi greiði* does not occur elsewhere in the materials which he and his staff have assembled. He points out that until very recently *greiði* in the sense of hospitality signified lodging and food.

Just as "die Verfasser des kymrischen Peredur und des englischen Sir Perceval beseitigten . . . den Gral vollständig und erfanden dafür etwas ganz anderes und Neues," (W. Golther, p. 115), the Scandinavian translator-author of the *Parcevals* saga, not understanding *graal* or *braull*, may have substituted one unknown for another. Until more or better evidence is available, we cannot fully explain *braull* or *ganganda greiða*. At present, therefore, the disputed passage can be interpreted only as,

She bore in her hands what most nearly resembled a book of the Gospels and they call it *braull* in the French language, but we may call it *ganganda greiða*.

University of Illinois

P. M. MITCHELL

The Source of du Bellay's "Les Louanges d'Amour"

Every additional bit of evidence of the close relationship between French and Italian humanism in the Renaissance is of interest. It adds to our understanding of how the awakening spread and of how the individual Renaissance poet worked. Thus it is important to note that one of du Bellay's most highly praised odes,¹ "Les Louanges d'Amour,"² is in fact a translation from the Latin of Pontano with the addition of a prelude and conclusion suited to the vernacular taste. That is, du Bellay, after a neo-Petrarchan setting suggested, perhaps, by Pontano's opening stanza, but more in keeping with the popular, vernacular, medieval, French and Italian traditions than with the neo-Latin, translates Pontano's "De amoris Dominatu" from begin-

¹ Henri Chamard, *Joachim du Bellay* (Lille, 1900), p. 207, speaks of du Bellay's "happy inspiration" in his "Louanges d'Amour." In his critical edition of du Bellay's poems, *Œuvres poétiques*, III, *Recueils lyriques* (Paris, 1912), II, in a note on "Louanges d'Amour," Chamard suggests Ovid, *Fast.* IV, 91 ff., as the source of du Bellay's inspiration here and cites parallel passages in Ronsard and Baïf. So much better are French scholars at finding classical than humanist sources.

² Chamard, ed., *Œuvres poétiques*, III, 11-15.

ning to end; he then concludes with a pastiche of the currently popular *trecento* idealism, Ficinian neo-Platonism, and Horatian-Anacreontic hedonism.

In the gnomic tradition of Pindar and Horace, Pontano begins:

Et sitim sedat liquor, et relaxant
Corda languentem latices Thyonei;
Ocium fessos levat: ast amantum
Pectora carmen.³

Du Bellay, developing the hints of water and rest, the languishing and the tired, expands this into

Le cler ruyselet courant,
Murmurant
Aupres de l'hospitale ombre,
Plaist a ceux qui sont lassez,
Et pressez
De chault, de soif et d'encombre.
Et ceux qu'Amour vient saisir,
Leur plaisir,
C'est parler de luy souvent.
D'Amour soyez doncq', mes chantz,
Par ces champs,
Dessoubz la frescheur du vent.
Ces eaux cleres et bruyantes,
Eaux fuyantes
D'un cours assez doux et lent,
Donneront quelque froideur
A l'ardeur
De mon feu trop violent.

Like Bernardo Tasso when he was adapting a humanist poem to the vernacular,⁴ du Bellay has recreated the familiar medieval setting for a love poem and established the popular Petrarchan mood.

³ Giovanni Gioviani Pontano, *Opera*, IV, *Carminum* (Basileae, 1556), 3527-28.

⁴ See Bernardo Tasso, "A l'Aurora," *Libro de gli Amori . . . Hinni et ode . . .* (Vinegia, 1534), p. 75r.

A te amaranthi, e rose;
Et amomo odorato
Con spirar dolce, e grato
Portano l'aure lievi, et amorose:
Le sorelle dogliose
Ti salutano con lor soave canto
Tra piu frondosi rami,
Accio che 'l lume santo
Tolga a la terra il tenebroso manto.

Now, following Pontano, who himself echoes Horace's dithyramb (*Carm.* II, 19, lines 1-2), du Bellay prays Erato, the muse of erotic poetry, to let him hear her song. The description of the power of love that follows is translated from Pontano, as a confrontation of the two texts immediately shows:

Le Roy, le Pere des Dieux
Tient les cieux
Dessoubz son obeïssance,
Neptune la mer tempere
Et son frere
Sur les enfers a puissance.

Mais ce petit Dieu d'aymer,
Ciel et mer
Et le plus bas de la terre,
D'un sceptre victorieux,
Glorieux,
Soubs son pouvoir tient et serre.

Sans luy, du ciel le haut temple,
Large et ample,
En ruyne tumberoit,
Avecq' chacun element,
Tellement
Discorde par tout seroit.

Amour, gouverneur des villes,
Loix civiles
Et juste police ordonne,
Et l'heur de paix, qu'on va tant
Souhaitant,
C'est luy seul qui le nous donne.

Les richesses de Ceres,
Les forests,
Les seps, les plantes et fleurs
Prennent d'Amour origine,
Goust, racine.
Vertu, formes et couleurs.

Par luy tout genre d'oyseaux
Sur les eaux

Compare with Marc Antonio Flaminio, "Hymnus in Auroram," *Marci Antonii, Joannis Antonii et Gabrielis Flaminiorum Forocorneliensium Carmina* (Patauii, 1743), pp. 11-12:

En tibi suaves violas, erocumque,
En odorati calathos amomi:
Surgit, et nostros tibi dulces aura
Portat odores.

Imperat coelo pater ipse diuûm:
Imperant dii, semideique terris:
Imperat ponto Ennosigaeus: imis
Orcus auernis.

At polo, et terris, erebo, marique
Imperatque et dis Amor: huius orbis
Paret edicto, superique et omnis
Grege animantium.

Hoc sine et coeli status, et deorum
Pax ruet: terra hoc sine, pontus, aër,
Et laborabunt odio, et suapte
Mole dehiscent.

Urbium custos Amor omniumque
Gentium rector, placidaeque pacis
Autor, et leges moderantur, aequo et
Iure gubernat.

Huius et iussu seges, huius arbor
Induit florem: statuunt uolucres
Nidum, et in prolem pecudes, feraeque
Sponte feruntur.

Et part les boys s'entretient.
 Tout animal de servaige
 Et sauvage
 De luy son essence tient.

Par ce petit Dieu puissant,
 Delaissant
 Le doux gyron de la mere,
 La vierge femme se treuve,
 Et fait preuve
 De la flamme douceamere.

Hoc duce et uirgo sequitur maritum,
 Et domo, et matris gremio relictis,
 Hac ope humanum genus, et propago
 Cuncta perennat.

However, where Pontano, harking back to the heavy-hearted lover of stanza one, concludes with a simple and conventional prayer to love to be kind, du Bellay again borrows from Italy's idealistic medieval tradition to make a fitting, modern conclusion to his poem, just as Bernardo Tasso had done in his pioneer adaptation of Flaminio's "Hymnus in Auroram" to the Italian language and modern times.⁵ We are reminded of Guido Guinizelli's "Al cor gentil ripara sempre amore" and of Dante's "Amore e cor gentil sono una cosa" (*Vita Nuova*, xx, 3) on the one hand, and of Spenser's *An Hymne in Honour of Love* on the other. Du Bellay goes on to a final, summary praise of love. The last stanza, a commonplace with du Bellay,⁶ is in the familiar Anacreontic-Horatian *carpe diem* tradition. In typical Pléiade fashion it tinges with sadness and with personal emotion a poem that is otherwise objective and classical.

Paris

CAROL HOPKINS MADDISON

The Abbé Goujet's "Pot-pourri"

The Rouen municipal library possesses an unpublished and undescribed MS in the hand of the abbé Goujet entitled "Pot-pourri odoriférant de littérature, ou recueil de pièces choisies à loisir."¹ This

⁵ In the humanist poem dawn wrenches the weeping lover from his mistress's couch and he curses her. But the poet himself welcomes the light and prays for length of days. In Tasso's poem, dawn gives the lover the promise of his lady's face. Soon the poet will look into the fond eyes of his *donna* who alone can compare in her beauty with the dawn.

⁶ Compare, for example, "Du Premier Jour de l'an," *Œuvres poétiques*, III, 26-9.

¹ The subtitle continues, "... de différens auteurs, sur différentes matières, en différens stiles, langages, et langues, goûts, et genres, tant-en prose latine

item would seem to deserve cursory description: it has at the least the merit of shedding new light on the personality of the author of the eighteen volumes of the *Bibliothèque françoise*.²

The first of the two volumes of the MS has a preface beginning with the somewhat commonplace observation that relaxation is necessary to the mind, if the mind is to continue without distress.³ Then displaying what might best be construed as abbatial prudence, the abbé continues with the caution that, if "le délassement" be pursued without reserve, such conduct will turn upon itself and foster the state of distress to be avoided in the first place. But this dilemma may be avoided, he gives assurance, if it be borne in mind that "de tous les délassemens celui qui peut estre utile à l'esprit est le meilleur; et c'est celui aussi que j'ai en vue dans la composition de ce recueil." Having delivered himself of this liminary sentiment and having given a hint simultaneously of the directions to be followed in his "pot-pourri," the abbé explains in good humor that "le goût" has been his guide in selecting the pieces constituting his latest work. Also, since variety is a necessary virtue, he has tried to "diversifier les sujets, de façon que le sérieux et le badin, le noble et le simple, le touchant, le patétique même et le plaisant se trouvassent entre-tassés noblement, et se donnassent un agréable baiser." The concluding lines of the preface are devoted to explaining the author's wish to remain anonymous: he seeks neither contemporary nor posthumous fame; his only desire is that the reader have a profitable text for moments when the mind might seek recreation.

Then, apparently not satisfied that his preface communicates all that he would convey, the abbé offers a second prefatory section directed to the "lecteur complaisant, ou plaisant de quelque genre qu'il

qu'en prose françoise, tant en poésie latine qu'en poésie françoise. Le tout valable et digne du jour. Recueillies par un auteur clandestin *****." A later hand has added above the asterisks, "l'abbé Goujet." Cf. *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France*, Départements, II, Rouen, Suite et fin (Paris, 1888), 84, no. 3088-3089 (2901).

² One may only guess why the abbé Goujet's contemporary and only thorough biographer, the abbé Barral, should not have made some reference to the "Pot-pourri odoriférant." His *Mémoires historiques et littéraires de M. l'abbé Goujet* (La Haye, 1767), 137-224, presents a bibliography of the abbé Goujet's work but says nothing of the MS here or elsewhere in the book, which extends from Goujet's birth on October 19, 1679 until June 5, 1765, only twenty months before the polygraph's death on February 1, 1767.

³ "Tome Premier" is to be published, according to the title-page, "A la Chine, chez Véronique Multimodis, marchand de science et d'ennui, imprimeur ordinaire et extraordinaire des Jésuites, à l'enseigne du Salmi / de toute année et de toute saison / avec l'approbation de l'Académie des Beaux Esprits. / Le second volume est sous presse." The preface is in six pages.

soit, masculin ou féminin." This "avis" is formally divided into four sections and presents "quelques réflexions sur le corps de l'ouvrage." The first explains that the title of a work should be an abridgment of its contents, a hint of things to come; he records the titles discarded in favor of his ultimate choice, *Pot-pourri odoriférant*.⁴ The second section calls attention to the possibility that the gentler sex might take objection to some of the items in his compilation; the abbé must beg for indulgence, therefore, while giving assurance of allowing feminine critics to voice their opinions. The third and fourth statements do no more than point to the indices while pleading for the skill and sincerity of the translations from Latin. His concluding sentiments express the hope of having managed to mingle what is pleasant with what is useful.⁵

And what constitutes the substance proper of this first volume of the *Pot-pourri*? It is a collection of miscellanea in prose and poetry; and the forms of the pieces included are as diverse as the material itself. The most numerous of the discernible categories of composition are devoted to or written by personalities well known in the literary, political, religious and social worlds. This first volume of nearly 450 pages contains, for example, items concerning Louis XIV (53 pieces), Cardinals Fleury and Richelieu (16 pieces each), and the Dauphin under Louis XV (5 pieces). The Jesuits are the organization inspiring the greatest number of inclusions (16); the most celebrated writers represented are Boileau (3), La Fontaine (2), Molière (2), Racine (3), Voltaire (4). Certain topics merit treatment, such as "Affaires du Tens" (10) "Dames" (8), and "Secret" (4). But the greatest number of items are in the minor genres: there are only four sonnets, five fables, and two rondeaux but there are thirty-four chansons, thirty-nine enigmas, sixteen epigrams, and thirty-four epitaphs. The total number of items in the first volume is about 350.

The second volume of the MS follows the patterns of the first in form, style, and substance with minor variations.⁶ While there is

⁴ The rejected titles are: a) *La Récréation solide, ou remèdes contre la mélancolie*; b) *Variétés ingénieuses, ou la curiosité de l'imagination*; c) *Le Délassement de l'esprit, ou le quart d'heure de récréation*; d) *Boutique de quincailleries spirituelle, ou recueil de rébus plaisans pour divertir les malades d'esprit*.

⁵ The abbé Goujet furnishes his own "approbation" and signs it "à Paris ce 1 juillet 1745." He is certain of royal permission to print his work: it is marked by "la variété ingénieuse . . . le sçavoir lumineux . . . le scintillant d'esprit."

⁶ The title-page, for example, is the same except for the addition of a whimsi-

no preface, there is another "avis" wherein the abbot complains that "plusieurs ont dit de la préface du premier volume qu'elle était longue et platte comme l'épée de Charlemagne." He also explains that his compilation should meet with favor in the public forum, because it is "une espèce de cassette de bijoux que j'offre aux deux sexes pour découvrir leur goût et leurs sentimens." And he is certain as well that "l'enfance y rira, la jeunesse s'y délectera, l'homme fait s'y récréera, et le vieillard enfin s'y amusera."

There are 240 compositions of much the same nature and frequency in the second volume as in the first. Epigrams, epitaphs, and enigmas abound, but the "bon mot," "épître," "plaisanterie," and "relation" have become more prominent, if one may measure prominence by the number of times a form is included. There are examples of the "allégorie," "discours" and "placet"; Goujet also records eight entries for the French Academy, ten for the "bon mot," twenty-two chansons; eight pieces are concerned with Madame la Dauphine and nine with Voltaire. Louis XIV is the subject of eight selections, but he is now outstripped by Louis XV, who is the center of attraction in twenty-two instances.

The amount of material in the MS is ample and varied, and the nearly six hundred literary or quasi-literary compositions and historical or pseudo-historical documents give pause. One has the feeling of being thrust into an old curiosity shop where the dustiest corner bids fair to harbor sudden treasure. And even if the literary items should fail to display sparks of genius or the historical pieces should prove spurious, here is a prime sign of the times, a guidepost pointing to the interests and tastes of Paris and France in the first half of the eighteenth century. The abbé Goujet was an informed man, and he may scarcely be accused of not being aware of the tenor of his times. Also, as an eighteenth-century polygraph, he may be accorded the credit of an educated and constant curiosity, leading of itself to a pertinent compilation.

It would appear worthwhile noting the existence of MS no. 3088-3089 (2901) in the municipal library at Rouen, then, not only for the purpose of showing that the abbé Goujet could be as witty as he was polygraphic, but also because further study of the MS might unearth, here or there, something worth assaying.

Marquette University

SPIRE PITOU

cal line at the bottom of the page: "Le suivant ou le troisième volume est dans la tête du public."

Baudelaire and Corneille: A Parallel

Baudelaire, discussing make-up as woman's employment of art to succor Nature, cites the song "La Nature embellit la beauté!" as a representative statement of "L'esthétique des gens qui ne pensent pas!"¹ He blames the eighteenth century for developing errors of this sort, which he links to a false conception of ethics: "La nature fut prise dans ce temps-là comme base, source et type de tout bien et de tout beau possibles" (p. 903). Baudelaire vigorously rejects any such emotional understanding of Nature. There is no particular virtue in Nature's control of our necessity to eat, sleep, drink, and conquer obstacles to our survival. There is no glory in a Nature that urges us to kill, eat, imprison and torture our fellow beings: "Passez en revue, analysez tout ce qui est naturel, toutes les actions et les désirs du pur homme naturel, vous ne trouverez rien que d'affreux" (p. 943).

Baudelaire apparently feels it unnecessary to state that the eighteenth century offered some views on art and nature not in this current of "sensibilité" that he attacks, but closer to his own. These were of course a part of the eighteenth-century prolongation of the classical doctrine of the previous century. There is indeed a startling parallel to Baudelaire's passage on "maquillage" in a seventeenth-century play.

It is unlikely that Baudelaire was himself aware of the extremely close kinship to his views expressed in *La Comédie des Tuilleries* (1635) by "the five authors." Voltaire, Marty-Laveaux, and Dr. Lancaster offer combined evidence that the third act of this play was written by Corneille.² It is in Act III (5) that Florine defends herself against the attacks of Orphise, who would see immorality in the use of ornamentation:

On vous cognoist assez, & vous estes de celles,
Que mille fois le plastre a fait passer pour belles;
Dont la vertu consiste en de vains ornemens;
Qui changent tous les jours de rabats & d'Amans.

This is the traditional attack, exactly what Baudelaire thinks of when

¹ "Eloge du maquillage" in "Le Peintre de la vie moderne," *Œuvres*, Pléiade ed. (Gallimard, 1931), p. 903. Later references are to this edition.

² For the discussion of the authorship of each act of this play, commissioned by Richelieu and written by Boisrobert, Colletet, Corneille, L'Estoile and Rotrou, see Henry C. Lancaster, *A History of French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century*, Part II (Johns Hopkins Press, 1932), I, 97-99.

he writes of ". . . l'usage de la poudre de riz, si niaisement anathématisé par les philosophes candides . . ." (p. 905). Florine, for her part, protests, "ma vie est innocente; & ma beauté naisve / Ne doit qu'à ses attraits les cœurs qu'elle captive." Florine makes it plain that she does not apply the art of make-up for the purpose of deception, "Si i'ay quelques deffauts, ils ne sont point cachés, / Sous le fard éclatant, que vous me reprochez." She would seem here not to go quite so far as Baudelaire, who writes, "Il importe fort peu que la ruse et l'artifice soient connus de tous, si le succès en est certain et l'effet toujours irrésistible" (p. 905). Baudelaire would not find praiseworthy, as no doubt Florine thinks it is, that her make-up does not hide all her defects, for he writes that make-up ". . . a pour but et pour résultat de faire disparaître du teint toutes les taches que la nature y a outrageusement semées . . ." (p. 905). Actually Florine's objective goes every bit as far as that of Baudelaire, who need not begrudge her the exaggerated honesty mentioned above. This can be seen as she continues her defense:

Quand la Nature manque, il la faut corriger;
Est-ce honte d'aller par ces Metamorphoses
A la perfection, où tendent toutes choses?
La Raison, la Nature, & l'Art en font leur but.

Like Florine, Baudelaire feels strongly the importance of the rôle of Reason in esthetics, as he indicates, writing, "Tout ce que je dis de la nature comme mauvaise conseillère en matière de morale, et de la raison comme véritable rédemptrice et réformatrice, peut être transporté dans l'ordre du beau" (p. 904). And like Florine, Baudelaire's attitude toward Nature is by no means one of total rejection. This is evident, as he writes, "Ainsi, si je suis bien compris, la peinture du visage ne doit pas être employée dans le but vulgaire, inavouable, d'imiter la belle nature et de rivaliser avec la jeunesse" (p. 905). This is precisely Florine's defense; she is young and naturally pretty enough to arouse the ardor of a suitor. However, she is willing to give Nature a helping hand. Baudelaire would warmly support this attitude, for he writes of woman, "Elle doit donc emprunter à tous les arts les moyens de s'élever au-dessus de la nature" (p. 905). Florine, like Baudelaire, would look at the final results in judging this matter of recourse to art:

Ceste Belle, en effet, de qui l'on parle tant,
Tient du secours de l'Art ce qu'elle a d'éclatant;

Cependant sa beauté, pour estre déguisée,
A-t-elle moins d'Amants? est-elle moins prisee?

Florine and Baudelaire are in complete agreement as to the end, just as they have been united as to means. Florine explains the goal to which these means are directed thus:

L'Amour, Roy de nos Coeurs, veut ces soins pour tribut,
Et tient pour bon suiet un esprit qui n'aspire,
Qu' à trouver les moyens d'aggrandir son Empire,
C'est gloire de mourir pour ce Maistre des Dieux,
Qui s'est privé pour vous de l'usage des yeux.
Si pour luy se défaire est un vray Sacrifice,
Se refaire pour luy, le nommez-vous un vice?
Ce qu'on fait pour luy plaire, osez-vous le blâmer?
Orphise, quand on aime, il se faut faire aymer,
L'Amour seul, de l'Amour est le prix veritable;
Et pour se faire aimer, il faut se faire aymable.

Baudelaire advances essentially the same argument in these terms, "La femme est bien dans son droit, et même elle accomplit une espèce de devoir en s'appliquant à paraître magique et surnaturelle; it faut qu'elle étonne, qu'elle charme; idole, elle doit se dorer pour être adorée" (p. 905). Like Florine, the poet considers that love, a divinity, can make beauty divine. "C'est dans ces considérations que l'artiste philosophe trouvera facilement la légitimation de toutes les pratiques employées dans tous les temps par les femmes pour consolider et diviniser, pour ainsi dire, leur fragile beauté" (p. 905).

The very close parallel between Florine's remarks and Baudelaire's joins in thought two great writers across a span of over two centuries. Their remarks on the limited subject of woman's use of make-up hint at concurring attitudes on some of the broader aspects of the Nature-Art question.

University of Rhode Island

JOHN VAN EERDE

On Zola's Habits of Revision

Although considerable attention has been paid to Zola's methods of composition, there has been relatively little study of the various stages at which he corrected his work after it had been printed.¹ We are

¹ The only important study of this kind that I know of is E. M. Grant's

well informed about his procedure before sending his manuscript to the printer: the assembling of material, the writing of an "ébauche," and character-sketches, and the final, relatively effortless writing of the manuscript itself. Corrections in the manuscripts (deposited in the Bibliothèque Nationale, the Bibliothèque Méjanès, and the Morgan Library) vary considerably in density from novel to novel, and are almost always stylistic.² But the correcting of the manuscript was only the first in a series of revisions which, though never as sweeping as those of a Balzac or a Proust, nevertheless, when taken altogether, demonstrate beyond a doubt that Zola was more particular about his style than we have generally believed. From a study of his comments on his own methods, in the Correspondence and elsewhere, and from the corrected proofs I have been able to examine, it seems likely that there were four main stages which followed upon his revision of the manuscript. These were as follows: revision of galleys for the serial (*feuilleton*) publication; revision of clippings from the *feuilleton* for the Charpentier edition; revision of page proofs for the Charpentier edition; revision of the first printing of the Charpentier edition. I have been able to examine, in each case for a different novel, examples of the last three stages. It is of course impossible to be certain that Zola always followed the same practice, since for no single novel do we have an example of every stage. But Zola was the most methodical of men, and I believe we may safely conclude that deviations from this pattern would have been the exception and not the rule.

In connection with Zola's proof corrections, we should bear in mind that he invariably began publication before his novel was actually complete. In some cases, *Nana* for example, he was under great pressure for copy. *Nana* was begun in August 1878 (*Corr.*, ed. Bernouard, II, 507), and completed in December 1879 (*Corr.*, II, 539); it began appearing in *Le Voltaire* of October 20, 1879, when only three chapters had been completed (II, 534, 536). Zola's correspon-

article, "The Composition of *La Curée*," RR, XLV (1954), 29-44, which studies the corrected *feuilleton* clippings of *La Curée*. For an examination of Zola's corrections of the manuscript and galleys of *La Terre*, see G. Robert: *La Terre d'Emile Zola* (Les Belles Lettres, 1952), pp. 245-262. As Robert points out, although it is unlikely there was an earlier complete version of the manuscript sent to the printer, Zola not infrequently copied passages which had become too heavily corrected for legibility.

² All the manuscripts of the *Rougon-Macquart* are in the Bibliothèque Nationale with the exception of *Nana*, which is in the J. Pierpont Morgan Library. The manuscripts of *Les Trois Villes* and *Les Quatre Evangiles* are in the Bibliothèque Méjanès.

dence at this time reveals the pressure he was under; on one occasion he urges Laffitte to slow up the publication for fear of using up the available copy; on another he complains that he is riveted to his desk. As a result, he was correcting the *feuilleton* clippings for *Nana* at the same time as he was finishing the manuscript. This may well have proved an excellent remedial exercise, for the later portions of the manuscript bear far fewer corrections than the earlier ones.³

A part of the *Nana* *feuilleton* clippings, with Zola's corrections, are preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale (N. A. Fr. 10312, 1-239), and correspond to pages 1 to 269 in the Charpentier edition of 1880. The rest, according to a penciled annotation, is missing. These corrections are not very numerous, averaging from three to five per page. However ff. 224, 225, and 226, corresponding to pages 253 and 254 in the Charpentier edition, have been added in Zola's hand. The paucity of corrections on the *Nana* *feuilleton* sheets is surprising in view of a remark he made in a letter to Flaubert (II, 539): "Je fais surtout sur le *feuilleton* imprimé un travail de tous les diables pour redresser les phrases qui me déplaisent, et elles me déplaisent toutes." And he commented a moment later: "[*Nana*] est horrible en *feuilleton*." The Goncourt Journal confirms Zola's concern: "Il nous confesse, qu'à la publication de son roman dans le *Voltaire*, l'écriture de la chose lui a paru détestable, et que pris d'un accès de purisme, il s'est mis à le récrire complètement, en sorte qu'après avoir travaillé toute la matinée, à la composition de ce qui n'était pas fait, il passait toute sa soirée, à reprendre et à retravailler son *feuilleton*" (1 février 1880, VI, 102-103). The actual rewriting, as we have seen, was confined to a mere three manuscript pages, but Zola's exaggeration may have been due to the lack of confidence in his own work which he frequently felt, and which could only have been aggravated by the ferocious attacks appearing in the press (*Corr.*, II, 537).

The Charpentier edition and the corrected *feuilleton* in the Bibliothèque Nationale do not exactly correspond, which suggests that Zola did correct page proof for *Nana*. These page proofs have not so far come to light, and indeed, until recently, no page proofs, as far as I know, have been available to scholars. I have recently had the opportunity of studying what I believe are the only extant page proofs of a Zola novel, those for *Le Docteur Pascal*. These consist of 310 unnumbered bound sheets, corrected in the author's hand. Although

³ Zola mentions correcting galley proof for *Nana* in a letter to Laffitte, editor of *Le Voltaire* (*Corr.*, II, 534).

there are no major changes, Zola has made a considerable number of alterations in the text. Each page has forty-three lines (as against thirty-five in the Charpentier edition) and the corrections range from one or two to as many as forty per page. The majority are excisions, as is usually the case, and indeed Zola's chief aim, from the time he finished a manuscript until it was in book form, seems to have been concision and condensation.⁴ In the page proofs of *Le Docteur Pascal*, one finds as many as five lines struck out at a time. Most of these illustrate an acute sense of what was superfluous, but a number of them indicate the author's desire to maintain consistency in character portrayal. In a dialogue in which Clotilde relates village gossip about Pascal's ill effect on his patients, the following sentence is struck out: "A entendre les femmes du faubourg, tous ceux qu'il pique pour les guérir en prennent un vrai choléra, sans compter qu'elles l'accusent d'avoir mis le diable dans son affaire."⁵ He may have omitted this phrase both because he wanted to avoid anticipating his discussion of Pascal's injections and to avoid any allusion to the conventional Satanic doctor, which he had already used long ago in *Madeleine Féral*.⁶

He drops a paragraph which might have made the scheming Félicité Rougon seem more sympathetic than she should: "Elle sanglota, elle continua d'une voix entrecoupée:—Va, va, on n'est le maître ni de soi ni des autres, les choses arrivent comme elles doivent . . . Ce sont de bien grands coups qui nous frappent, il faut s'en remettre à Dieu pour la continuation et la prospérité de notre famille."⁷ He discards another passage which attributes natural feelings to the perverted Maxime, where Pascal had said "qu'il fallait pardonner aux souffrances de Maxime, qu'il avait certainement pour elle beaucoup d'affec-

⁴ These page proofs are now in the library of the University of California, Los Angeles. Clipped to the bound volume is a visiting card addressed by Zola to "Monsieur Eugen Zabel, Goethestrasse 9 III, Charlottenbourg," and post-marked 16 mars 98. The card reads: "Avec mes bien vifs remerciements et l'assurance de toute ma sympathie. Emile Zola." This suggests that the novelist had presented the proofs to Zabel, a German critic and littérateur, who had written laudatory articles on Zola and Naturalism. Cf. R. J. Niess, *Emile Zola's Letters to J. Van Santen Kolff* (St. Louis, 1940), pp. 7, 9-10, 19. There are a number of manuscript additions of several lines, of which all but two (Charpentier, p. 263, "Elle retourna . . . pour les leur servir," and p. 347, "aurait voulu courir . . . écouté") are reworkings of sentences.

⁵ Charpentier, p. 34, after "et qui est mort sur une route."

⁶ This was the Faustian comte de Viargue, father of the hero Guillaume, who commits suicide in his father's laboratory.

⁷ In Charpentier, p. 245, after "il serait tout de même en cendre, à cette heure."

— Maman! maman!

Sa faiblesse, ~~son~~ ~~dont~~, devait ~~être~~ trop grande, car un engourdissement invincible le reprit, il laissa retomber sa tête; et ses yeux se refermèrent, il ~~se~~ se rendormir, comme s'il eût continué en rêve sa plainte, ~~son~~ ~~dont~~ gémissement ~~de~~ de plus en plus grêle et perdu :

— Maman! maman!

~~Maintenant~~, les images étaient inondées le velours noir de la veste et de la culotte, soutachées d'or, se souillait de longues rayures sanglantes; et le petit ~~visage~~ ~~front~~ rouge, entêté, s'était remis à couler de la narine gauche, sans arrêt, traversant la mare vermeille de la table, s'écrasant par terre, où finissait par se former un ~~petit~~ ~~visage~~. Un grand cri de la folle, un appel de terreur aurait suffi. Mais elle ne criait pas, elle n'appelait pas, immobile, ~~fixée~~ dans sa maison d'oubli, avec ses yeux fixes d'ancêtre qui regardait s'accomplir le destin. Elle ~~était~~ comme desséchée là, nouée, les membres et la langue liés par ses cent ans, le cerveau ossifié par la démence, dans l'incapacité de vouloir et d'agir. Et, cependant, la vue du petit ~~visage~~ rouge commençait à la remuer d'une émotion. Un tressaillement avait passé sur sa face morte, une chaleur montait à ses joues. Enfin, une dernière plainte la ramena toute.

— Maman! maman!

Alors, il y eut, chez Tante Dide, un visible et affreux combat. Elle porta ses mains de squelette à ses tempes, comme si elle avait senti son crâne éclater. Sa bouche s'était ouverte toute grande, et il n'en sortit aucun son : l'effrayant tumulte qui montait en elle, lui paralysait ~~toute~~ la langue. Elle s'efforça ~~de~~ de se lever, de courir; mais elle n'avait plus de muscles, elle resta clouée. Tout son pauvre corps tremblait, dans l'effort surhumain qu'elle faisait ainsi pour crier à l'aide, sans pouvoir rompre la prison de sénilité et de démence ~~où elle était enfermée~~. La face bouleversée, la mémoire éveillée ~~pour~~ ~~à~~ ~~peu~~, elle dut tout voir.

Et ce fut une agonie lente et très douce, dont le spectacle dura encore de longues minutes. Charles, comme rendormi, silencieux à présent, achevait de perdre le

Charpentier edition, pp. 241-42.

(Courtesy, the Department of Special Collections,
University of California Library, Los Angeles)

Il faudrait

— ~~Je voudrais~~, pour que je pusse vivre jusqu'à six heures, ~~il faudrait~~ que le poulx fût moins bas. ~~J'espérais~~ encore, mais le second mouvement ne se fait presque plus ~~il est bientôt l'arrêt définitif~~.

Et, dans un murmure ~~desespéré~~, il nomma Clotilde. ~~Plusieurs reprises~~. C'était ~~comme~~ un ~~appel~~ bégayé et déchirant, l'affreux chagrin qu'il éprouvait à ne pas la revoir.

~~Puis~~, le souci de ses manuscrits reparut, une ~~brève~~ ~~prise~~ ~~brilla~~ dans ses yeux ~~pendant qu'il trouvait le force~~ ~~le bégayer encore~~.

— Ne me quittez pas! la clef est sous mon oreiller! sous direz à Clotilde de la prendre, elle a des ordres.

A quatre heures moins dix, une nouvelle piqure resta sans effet. Et ~~comme~~ quatre heures allaient sonner, la deuxième crise se déclara. Brusquement, après avoir étouffé, il se jeta hors de son lit, il voulut se lever, marcher, dans un ~~formet~~ réveil de ses forces. Un besoin d'espace, de clarté, de grand air, le poussait en avant, là-bas ~~vers le ciel~~. Puis, c'était un appel irrésistible de la vie, de toute sa vie, qu'il entendait venir à lui, du fond de la salle voisine ~~où il avait reçu ses journées~~. Et il y ~~chancelait~~, chancelant, suffoquant, courbé à gauche, se rattachant aux meubles.

Vivement, le docteur Ramond s'était précipité pour le retenir.

— Maître, maître! recouchez-vous, je vous en supplie!

Mais Pascal, sourdement, s'entêtait à finir debout. La passion d'être encore, l'idée héroïque du travail, persistaient ~~pendant~~ en lui, l'emportaient comme une masse. Il râlait, il ~~bégayait~~.

Non, non... là-bas, là-bas...

Il fallut que son ami le soutint, et il s'en alla ainsi, trébuchant et hagard, jusqu'au fond de la salle, et il se laissa tomber sur sa chaise, devant sa table, où une page commencée traînait ~~parmi~~ parmi ~~le~~ désordre de papiers et de livres.

Là, un moment, il souffla, ses paupières se fermèrent. ~~Puis~~, il les rouvrit, tandis que ses mains tâtonnaient ~~cherchant~~ le travail ~~sans doute~~. Elles rencontrèrent l'Arbre généalogique, au milieu d'autres notes éparses. L'avant-veille encore, il y avait rectifié des dates. Et il le reconnut, l'attira, l'étala.

Charpentier edition, pp. 340-41.

(Courtesy, the Department of Special Collections,
University of California Library, Los Angeles)

tion et de reconnaissance."⁸ On the other hand, after Clotilde has gone to Paris to nurse her brother, he crosses out a sentence which might have tended to degrade her unduly: "Il ne lui donnait pas les clefs, la traitait en servante à laquelle on s'habitue difficilement."⁹ Another excision shows a characteristic shying away from psychological subtlety: Zola strikes out the following sentence analyzing Clotilde's and Pascal's new joy at being together after Maxime has asked his sister to join him: "Sans doute n'était-ce que ce premier déchirement d'inquiétude, dans leur tendresse, cette menace de se quitter, dont l'ajournement les enchantait."¹⁰

The famous death scenes in the novel—the spontaneous combustion of the drunkard Antoine Macquart, the death of the hemophilic child, Charles, and Pascal's fatal heart attack, of which he notes the effects until the end—were carefully corrected. The most worked-over pages, however, are those which describe Pascal's complex decision to let Clotilde go to Maxime, and his anguished longing for youth. In the case of the latter, Zola has suppressed with a thoroughness that one cannot help attributing to the autobiographical nature of the work any phrases which may have been somewhat too specific about the decline of old age: "Ah! la jeunesse, comme il y aurait mordu à pleines dents, comme il l'aurait revécue avec l'appétit vorace de toute la manger et de toute la boire, *avant que ses dents tombent, que ses membres faiblissent, que ses veines se glacent*," the italicized phrase being changed simply to *avant de vieillir*.¹¹

In all likelihood the chief reason why these page proofs are as heavily corrected as they are is that in the case of *Le Docteur Pascal*, the first two stages seem to have been eliminated. The novel did not appear in a daily *feuilleton*, but was published weekly, a chapter at a time, in *La Revue Hebdomadaire*, where the text corresponds exactly to that of the corrected page proofs.¹² This poses a puzzling problem, since the page proofs are set in the type face used for the Charpentier edition, which differs entirely from that used in *La Revue Hebdomadaire*. The dates of the serial publication suggest that the page proofs, destined for Charpentier, were sent first to *La Revue Hebdomadaire*, and that the serial was printed from them. The first batch of proof, consisting of two chapters, is stamped January 14; since the

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 323, after "de très bons conseils à Clotilde, lui répétant . . ."

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 315, after "exploité et dévalisé."

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 85, after "à se sentir si unis, inséparables."

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 172.

¹² A bound copy of each instalment, inscribed to J. Van Santen Kolff, is in the Houghton Library, FC8Z7470 893 dac.

first instalment appeared on March 18, there would have been ample time for Zola to correct them, and send them to the magazine, which would, after setting up two chapters, forward them to Charpentier.¹³

These page proofs show clearly what the corrected *feuilleton* sheets of *La Curée* and *Nana* could not, that for Zola the creative process continued until the plates were locked up for the final printing. Actually there is evidence that he carried the process even beyond this point. A copy of the first edition of *La Joie de vivre* (Charpentier, 1884), now in the Houghton Library, Cambridge, bears a considerable number of corrections in Zola's hand.¹⁴ This was apparently customary and explains why there are slight discrepancies between the corrected page proofs of *Le Docteur Pascal* and printings later than the first edition. In his copy of *La Joie de vivre* Zola could not of course make as many changes as he could in page proof, since the plates would presumably have been made. However, he kept careful count of the lines. For example, after making several changes on page 35, he noted "gagner les 3 lignes sur la page suivante," the final page in the chapter, which was three quarters blank. Despite these limitations, however, Zola made as many as six corrections per page. A typical reworking is the following, on page 216: "Il s'étonnait des sensations opposées et inexplicables qu'il découvrirait en lui," becomes, with the usual striving for concision: "pourquoi ces façons de sentir différentes et illogiques?" But a more interesting alteration at this late date, and the only one of its kind, is his substitution of an image for a commonplace adverbial phrase: on page 377 in the sentence "Assise au bord du lit, la jeune femme . . . se balançait *de droite à gauche*," the italicized phrase becomes "d'un mouvement d'horloge."

The various proof corrections on which we have briefly commented show a concern for style for which we rarely give Zola credit. The sum of the corrections from the first *feuilleton* proof to the first edition would not, of course, come close to equaling those of Balzac, whose corrections on the page proof of *Eugénie Grandet* (in the Morgan Library) frequently double the printed text. It should be remembered, however, that Zola's proof corrections followed those he

¹³ Zola began writing December 7, 1891 (letter of January 25, 1892, to Van Santen Kolff, quoted in the latter's "La Genèse du *Docteur Pascal*" which appeared in *La Revue Hebdomadaire*, March 18, 1893). The publication date was June 20, 1893, three days after the last instalment appeared in the magazine.

¹⁴ FC8Z7470 884 ja. Zola's corrections are both in ink and pencil; occasionally ink corrections are crossed out in pencil and others substituted, indicating that he went over the novel a second time.

made on the manuscript, and more important still, they followed the lengthy and painstaking "roughing out" of the *ébauche*, which is actually a first draft. My comments here have of course been based solely on the very few corrected proofs I have seen. It would have been possible, in addition, to compare for every novel three versions: the manuscript, the printed *feuilleton*, and the book, but I do not believe that such a gigantic undertaking would produce any more significant results than those I have already observed. It has become clearer than it was, I believe, that Zola was a seeker after artistic perfection; not the *mot juste*, perhaps, or the evocative image, but rhythm, concision, unity of style.

In this connection the following excerpt from an almost unknown self-analysis he dictated to a young psychologist is not without interest. He makes two points, first that the music or rhythm of his sentence is more important to him than individual words, and second, that the sentence, as he writes it down, after all the preliminaries have been accomplished, is already a finished product and in no way a first draft: "Chez moi le mot n'a pas grande importance . . . Quand j'écris, la phrase se fait en moi toujours par euphonie; c'est une musique qui me prend et que j'écoute . . . Je ne prépare pas la phrase toute faite; je me jette en elle comme on se jette à l'eau . . . ce que je fais de mieux est ce que je fais d'abord."¹⁵ In view of these assertions, one would not expect Zola's corrections through four stages of printed proof to be of earth-shaking proportions. That they should have continued through these four stages, and that they could, on occasion, be both extensive and complex, testifies to the artistic integrity of their author.

University of California, Los Angeles

JOHN C. LAPP

¹⁵ G. Saint-Paul: *Le Langage intérieur et les paraphrasies* (Alcan, 1904), pp. 85-86. But cf. Robert, p. 255: "fort peu de corrections paraissent inspirées par un souci d'euphonie ou d'eurythmie."

REVIEWS

Agostino Lombardo, *Il dramma pre-Shakespeariano: Studi sul teatro inglese dal Medioevo al Rinascimento* (Venezia: Neri Pozza, 1957. 231 pp. Collana di varia critica, 14). THIS book has an aesthetic purpose and, it must be said, shows good literary taste. The author pays no attention to sources, developments, interrelations, social characteristics or religious interests. This narrows his book and makes it of little general significance. His factual interests are slight. For example, he makes no distinction between plays on biblical subjects arising originally from the church services of the liturgical year and those based on the lives and martyrdoms of the saints, although these two kinds of religious drama are different both in formal function and in attitude and spirit. The first chapter, *Il miracle play*, is based on Sir Edmund Chambers, *The Mediaeval Stage* (Oxford, 1903), Vol. II, and that is a sound book. Other secondary sources of which the author makes use are unimportant, sometimes antiquated. The second part of the chapter is devoted to *The Sacrifice of Isaac* as it appears in the Brome Hall version. This study is sympathetic and has some perspicacity, but it hangs in the air, since the drama, treated as the work of an unknown author, derives its dramatic interest from the book of Genesis. The Brome *Abraham and Isaac* is moreover a late and popularized version of the barer and more typical Chester play. One sees no reason why the treatment of the play by the author might not have been equally interpretative but more intelligent if he had known these and other facts or, if he did know them, had made some allowance for them.

The same quality of narrowness appears throughout the book. There is evidence of insight and appreciation, but factual matters, usually relegated to footnotes, are not allowed to make their contribution. This critique accordingly lacks something, and that something is possibly actuality; for, after all, the best epistemology makes no allowance for a separation between elements of factual truth and elements of emotional coloring. Both are necessary for satisfaction.

The second chapter presents a commonplace but to some degree enlightening study of the morality play with special attention to *The Castle of Perseverance* and *The Summoning of Everyman*. The third is devoted to *Mankynd*, *Magnificence*, *Kyng Johan*, and *Wit and*

Science. *Magnificence* is not badly done, and the study of *Wit and Science* is excellent. *Kyng Johan* is a complicated play into which there enter discordant factors. The original source is of course *Antichristus*. To this are added certain features of *Pammachius* of Naogeorgus; also the anti-papacy of John Bale; and, finally, vague traditions of papal defiance by the Angevin King John of England. To see this play treated as an open field for dramatic originality and manipulation is a trifle shocking. As for the treatment of *Mankynd*, the author shows no consciousness that he has to do with what is probably the worst example in existence of the vulgarization, even dilapidation, of a play in the hands of low-class provincial actors. That wretched little company of strollers were not, by any stretch of the imagination, dramatists. The fifth chapter of the book presents what seems to me to be an intelligent and interesting study of *Gorboduc*.

University of Missouri

HARDIN CRAIG

Paul A. Jorgensen, *Shakespeare's Military World* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1956. xi + 345 pp. \$5.00).

THE author has read Shakespeare with care, gathering the references to military affairs of whatever sort. Moreover, he presents an array of explanatory passages from the military writers of the time, accessible in England. Since there had been many translations, the number is adequate, though some valuable works were not translated, and the art of war was more studied on the continent than in Britain. There are also a gratifying number of parallels with English literary works, though others can be found in Professor Raven I. McDavid's unpublished master's thesis, in Duke University Library.

It is especially strange that, with all his searching, Dr. Jorgensen failed to mention Beaumont and Fletcher's *Bonduca*. By contrast, this play emphasizes how little Shakespeare said about military tactics. Yet there are some references that I do not find Dr. Jorgensen making use of. In *Julius Caesar*, Shakespeare speaks of the two wings of the Caesarian army, and is conscious of the victory and defeat on those wings. In *Richard III*, there is attention to tactics and position. Richmond will "draw the form and model of our battle," (5.3.25). Stanley's

regiment lies half a mile at least

South from the mighty power of the king (5.3.37, 38).

Richard also attends to the disposition of his army:

Call up Lord Stanley, bid him bring his power.
I will lead forth my soldiers to the plain,
And thus my battle shall be ordered:
My foreward shall be drawn out all in length,
Consisting equally of horse and foot;
Our archers shall be placed in the midst.
John Duke of Norfolk, Thomas Earl of Surrey,
Shall have the leading of this foot and horse.
They thus directed, we will follow
In the main battle, whose puissance on either side
Shall be well winged with our chiefest horse (5.3.290 ff.).

The dramatist was not enough interested to tell of the dispositions on the other side, as Ariosto did when describing a battle in his incomplete ms. called the *Cinque Canti* (5.46, 48). The conflict described in *Cymbeline* 5.3, called by Dr. Jorgensen "Shakespeare's longest strategic explanation of an engagement," is not the result of any general's planning, falling rather under the heading of a heroic deed than of strategy, though perhaps Shakespeare, like Wellington later, knew that a commander was foolish to fight where he could retreat only through a defile. Shakespeare here gives an example of what the military historian Napier pointed out, that in the vicissitudes of battle men who had appeared cowards might become "the life of the need."

Admirably Dr. Jorgensen points out that Shakespeare "was not a professional, nor even a conscientious student of military science" (viii). This condition might seem to preclude systematic study of the matter, as emphasizing the incidental and popular character of Shakespeare's military references, many though they are. Such incidental interest is only a sort of back door for entering upon more general criticism of the plays, such as *Henry V*. On this play the author makes some excellent observations, as in discussion of Williams as more logical than the ambitious conqueror (165-8), but he does not draw conclusions from his comments.¹ Perhaps Dr. Jorgensen's abundant illustrative matter would have been more effective if presented not in the form of a conventional book but as a series of notes on classified passages. At the present time readers will profit from any application of a theory of minimum interpretation.

The University of Southern California

ALLAN GILBERT

¹ For discussion of this and other matters I refer to my "Patriotism and Satire in *Henry V*," in *Studies in Shakespeare* (Miami University), 1943, pp. 40-64.

R. M. Wiles, *Serial Publication in England before 1750* (New York: Cambridge Univ. Press. xv + 391 pp. \$9.50). IT is generally known that in the 1830's Dickens, Thackeray, and other Victorian novelists began to publish new works in "parts" before issuing them as complete books. That the practice was fully established a hundred years sooner, however, is not well known. Only now, in fact, with the publication of R. M. Wiles' *Serial Publications in England before 1750* has it been possible to discover the extent to which installments of a work were stitched in small packets and delivered regularly to subscribers, thereby making both new and old books available to many readers who had previously been unable to afford them.

The plan itself was admirably simple: if the customer cannot or will not buy a book because he does not have enough money, then sell it to him in portions on a pay-as-you-go basis, a certain number of pages each month or each week, at a cash price so low he cannot resist. That the plan was amazingly successful can be judged from the fact that all of the important publishers of London were soon delivering every week or month great quantities of number-book parts to the houses of subscribers, or sending them forth to be sold in the streets by hawkers. The practice soon became big business, in fact, and in some of its aspects singularly reminds one of modern day competition and promotion practices.

The subjects and titles of these serial publications are remarkable. You could buy the Bible in numbers, with or without annotations; you could buy *Paradise Lost*, *Don Quixote*, or Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*; you could buy collected sermons, songs, maps, plays, Latin classics, grammatical treatises, and reports of scientific research; you could buy the biography of Christ, of Cromwell, of Sir Walter Raleigh, of Queen Anne, of Quarll the hermit, of Peter the Great, of the Kings of England, of the most notorious female robbers and 'pyratesses'; you could buy dictionaries, encyclopedias, books of travel, records of famous trials and executions, collections of rare documents; you could buy treatises on architecture, astronomy, penmanship, topography, conveyancing, painting, and herbs—anything, in fact.

Professor Wiles' book becomes, therefore, an interesting, though somewhat specialized, chapter in the cultural history of the eighteenth century. But specialized though it is, it holds interest for individuals in quite a number of specialty fields: for those who are concerned with the growth of the English book trade; for historical critics of the novel and the drama; for specialists in any of the authors whose works were published in this way (and this includes almost every important

author) ; for bibliographers, who will find in the appendix an extensive list of books produced serially, some of which will now be set in a new light ; and for still others who may be concerned with copyright laws, the growth of advertising, and so on.

This is not to say that the volume has nothing of value for the student of general cultural history ; it does, especially in the first, second, and seventh chapters, even though he may wish to do no more than skim those that lie between. There are, for example, the customers who bought these serial publications. Did they get their money's worth, were their reading habits really extended and improved ? Much of what they purchased, of course, was nothing more than trash, and much of it can no longer be read with profit ; but this is so mainly because most of the books fall into De Quincey's category of the literature of knowledge rather than that of power, and have simply become outmoded by the progress of knowledge itself. But more important even than the good books—and there were many of these too—is the important fact that this mode of publication made it possible and easy for middle- and lower-class Englishmen to buy and read books. As the author points out, "This is an admirable habit. It is a habit which not even television and astounding twentieth-century diversions have been able to break."

Professor Wiles has given his account well. The organization makes sense, the appendices seem complete and valuable, and the style is pleasant while at the same time giving the comforting impression that the author has a thorough command of his subject.

University of Kentucky

W. S. WARD

A. H. Smith, *English Place-Name Elements* (New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1956. Vol. I: lv + 305 pp. Vol. II: 417 pp. English Place-Name Society: Vols. 25, 26. \$6.50 each). THE publication of English place-name surveys by the English Place-Name Society has been in progress for more than thirty years and has now covered nearly half the country. As a rule each volume covers a county, and includes all major names extant before the late fifteenth century. The whole series is of solid scholarly quality, and bears eloquent witness of the high level of English onomatology. In addition to the publications of the Place-Name Society, English place-name literature includes a multitude of older and more recent books, dissertations and articles,

in great part of equally high quality. Because the material published in this field has grown so vast, we welcome with satisfaction A. H. Smith's new survey of the words and name-elements found in English place-names.

The purpose of *English Place-Name Elements* is to present in one book all the material that would otherwise have to be repeated in succeeding volumes of the Society's publications and in other place-name literature. It will also be a convenient source of references to earlier theories and discussions in connection with certain name elements and types of place-names. Furthermore it gives a broad picture of the lexicographical results of over thirty years of English place-name research. Thus A. H. Smith's book has a much wider scope than Sir Allen Mawer's otherwise excellent *Chief Elements Used in English Place-Names*, 1930. Smith's book also includes a great number of elements that occur only in few or unique cases, but have a special value because they provide new linguistic evidence, "often carrying archaic and obsolete words of the earliest times forward to the period of recorded language, and as often taking the history of recorded vocabulary back to a much older phase of the language (as with *bāce*², *ball*, *clodd*, *clōh*, *cut*, *fogga*, *grāg*², *horn-bēam*, *hylloc*, *pigga*, *pund*, *sceald*, *scydd*, *snabbe*, *spyrt*, *trōg*, *werpels*, *windels*)." Smith's book will surely prove as useful to the linguists as to the onomatologists, and may save them much tedious and time-consuming work in searching through the mass of place-name literature for desired information.

A publication of this sort requires tremendous preliminary work, and wide knowledge on the part of the author. In my opinion A. H. Smith has done an excellent job. In a short introduction he has accounted for the principles followed in the compilation of the book, and given a survey of findings, problems and methods of English place-name research. The introduction is well written and very informative. The author does not content himself merely with pointing out the problems. Rather, he leads the reader through extensive discussions of them by his numerous references to entries in the book where the details in each instance are discussed. This makes the book far more than a mere dictionary of place-name elements. Used according to the directions in the introduction the book might well serve as an introduction to English place-name study in general.

The main part of the two volumes consists of a dictionary of individual place-name elements. The entries are given in the traditional normalized form commonly used in the dictionaries of the various

languages that have contributed to English place-names, such as Old English, Celtic, Old French, Old Norse, Latin and others. Variants, dialectal forms and later forms are often included, with cross-references to the normalized head-words. The author is, of course, aware of the fact that many of the entries are anachronistic, for example, many Scandinavian words are written in an Old Norse or Icelandic form which is considerably younger than the form these words had at the time they first occurred in English place-names.

In each article there is information about the meaning or meanings of the head-word in place-names; the usage and distribution of it as a first element; as a simple place-name; as a last element; and as an affix. And finally etymological cognates and related words are given. The various articles are profusely illustrated by examples and reference to sources. For example, if there has been discussion about the meaning or the etymology of an element, the different view-points are summarized and often evaluated by the author. Especially interesting and valuable are the long and comprehensive articles touching upon major problems in English place-name study, e. g. the article on elements like *burh*, *bȳ*, *-ing*, *leah*, *stoc*, *tūn*, *þorp*, *þrop*, *þveit*, *walh*, *wic*, *word*, and others. The second volume also contains an index of all place-names that are mentioned in both volumes, all together about 13,000 names, with page references and information pertaining to the districts in which they occur.

Nine very instructive maps go with the book. They show the distribution of some important name elements; Old English dialect regions; the extent of Irish-Norwegian place-names; the Scandinavian settlement; and also a map showing the progress of the Society's county-surveys.

Both the dictionary of place-name elements and the map of the Scandinavian settlement show clearly how great the Scandinavian influence has been in the northern parts of England. This impression is also emphasized by the numerous Scandinavian works and books of reference in the bibliography of works consulted by the author. On account of my special connection with Scandinavian studies, I shall limit my few corrections to the Scandinavian material.

The vowels *a*, *o*, *ø*, *u* were in Old Icelandic lengthened before cacuminal *l* + consonant, but normally not in Old Norwegian. It is therefore inconsistent to write the following words with long vowels: *bálkr*, *hjálmr*, *kálfr*, *skjálf*, *stólpi*, *úlfr* in Icelandic orthography, and at the same time to write *folk*, *hals*, *holmr*, *holmi*, and others with short vowels according to Old Norwegian orthography. This incon-

sistency is probably accounted for by the fact that the author in some instances has followed the spelling in Cleasby-Vigfusson's Icelandic-English Dictionary, in others the spelling in Old Norw. dictionaries. Specific Icelandic is also the long vowel in the word *rúgr* "rye." Wrong use of the accent is found in *lúndr, súðr*, should be *lundr, suðr*; and the accent is lacking in *bondi, hvitr, únytr*, should be *bóndi, hvítr, únýtr*.

The author says that all head-words are substantives in the nominative singular. But the following forms are not nominative: *ál, gang, heim, hring, leik*, should be *áll, gangr, heimr, hringr, leikr*. Nominative *-r* is also lacking in the adjective *kald*, should be *kaldr*.

Confusion of two words is probably the reason for the wrong form *lqgr*, translated "a law." The masculine *lqgr* means "sea, water, liquid," while *lqg*, which is neuter plural in Old Norse, means "law." The head-word *reinn* looks in this form like a masculine; it should be *rein*, fem. "a boundary strip." In this connection I find it regrettable that the author does not give information about the gender of the nouns. The grammatical gender is an inseparable part of the word, and often decisive for the meaning.

In my opinion it is wrong to list the head-word *kol(r)* "coal-black" as a regular adjective. One may maintain that the word has an adjectival function as a first component in some compound place-names, but it is never found as a regular adjective in Scandinavian.

In numerous cases the interpretation of a place-name must be considered tentative, or even guess-work. There is no doubt that many onomatologists will take exception to such uncertain interpretations, and thus the book may inspire renewed studies of certain names or name-elements.

I want to emphasize that neither the unavoidable uncertain interpretations nor the comparatively few inconsistencies that I have mentioned reduce the value of the book to any appreciable extent. The total impression is that *English Place-Name Elements* is a work of the highest scholarly quality. It will no doubt become an indispensable aid not only for English place-name study, but for Germanic onomatology and linguistics in general.

The book is dedicated to Eilert Ekwall, professor emeritus of English Philology at Lund University, Sweden, in acknowledgement of his great contributions to English place-name studies.

University of California, Berkeley

HAAKON HAMRE

G. Malcolm Laws, Jr., *American Balladry from British Broad-sides* (Philadelphia: The American Folklore Society, 1957. xiii + 315 pp. Publications of the American Folklore Society: Bibliographical and Special Series, 8. \$5.00; \$4.50 to members). THIS volume completes a trio published by the Society, the first two of which are Tristram Coffin's *The British Traditional Ballad in North America* and Laws' *Native American Balladry*. The three volumes comprise a description of most American "ballads" in print—Coffin of the Child ballads, Laws' first book of ballads originating in the United States and Canada, and the present book of the limbo in between—British broadsides which did not fit Child's somewhat fluid canon but which, like many of his narratives, leapt the Atlantic to become a part of American traditional song. Broad-sides which can be classed as part of the Child complex are not included by Laws.

On the basis of this division of labor a small limbo might still have remained—American ballads neither in Child nor firmly attested by broadsides which still are derived from England. Laws has included such pieces in his latest syllabus, since there are no sure tests to exclude them from the broadside ilk. Such a song, for instance, is "Two Lovers Discoursing," numbered by Laws O 22. Neither Laws nor his sole authority, Doerflinger's *Shantymen and Shantyboys*, provides evidence of broadside origin, and such tests of form and formula as Laws urges without dogmatism (pp. 88 ff.) cannot wholly supply the lack of an identified broadside, slipsheet, or chapbook version. We must assume that he has included them silently to avoid a further corpus which complete silence would have left uncued. This caveat is entered with no thought of serious criticism, but one wishes that Laws had clearly labelled such trimmers as just what they are to guide us in further search for broadside sources, especially in British libraries, which Laws has not yet visited.

Though over half the book is a classification and description of separate ballad identities, it is no mere bibliography, but contains a wide-ranging and perceptive introduction on the problems raised by such meta-Child study. It first discusses the American progeny of the broadside, which "have as much right as the Child pieces to be called popular ballads." It makes no inappropriate claims for their aesthetic value, but rightly claims that neither literary nor social historian can ignore them, in view of their surprising endurance. "Admittedly the ballads are often dull, prosaic, and conventional, but so also is the life of the average man." Criticism, in short, however valid an approach to folksong, can only confuse the collector and classifier when

it intrudes beyond its proper domain. Chapter II discusses "broadside ballads" from their beginnings in Autolycus's single sheets to the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century garlands, chapbooks, and songsters. Not all were the product of city hack writers. Some may have actually been collected from the folk, which was exploited long before it was discovered by Hollywood and the recording companies. Study of this new corpus, drawn in large part from late immigrants including the Irish, places significantly more weight on Northern ports and publishers in New York and Boston as channels for traditional song than our common puristic inclination towards the Southern hills has hitherto allowed. Such cities, if upstarts in the field of folksong at all, were upstarts long before the nineteen thirties. (Appendix II, which lists British and American publishers of the last century, should be the springboard for important future study.) Authentic folksingers like Alexander Harrison of Nova Scotia, as Laws shows clearly, derived much of his repertory from print.

This latter point is carried out more fully in Chapter III, Broadside Balladry as Traditional Song. Laws demonstrates Child's medievalistic and upper class biases, but with all the courtesy we owe to the pioneer and master. A valuable table (p. 66), comparing six major American collections, shows conclusively that British broadsides are overwhelmingly the major source of American balladry, and leads to the important observation that "the more frequently a ballad was reprinted a century or so ago, the greater the likelihood of its continued vitality in tradition." The concept of the folk as destination rather than as origin has clearly won the day. The final chapter provides stylistic analysis and tests for ballad identification, and discusses a much neglected subject, the rewriting of ballads. Such rewriting is illustrated deftly with "The Wexford Girl" and its variants, a ballad entity which shares the theme of Dreiser's *American Tragedy*.

Archiving and the proper evaluation of field collecting will surely be vastly more efficient now that Coffin and Laws have done their work. If anyone wishes to enter a cavil that the archival material should have been included, we can only answer that the study of the folktale, however aided by Aarne's *Types*, has led to much frustration because its center of interest is mainly unpublished collections, hard to obtain on this side of the ocean. Material in print, the property of scholars in any good library, should be indexed before archival calendars are composed. The three volumes of the American Folklore Society, added to the recent two indexes of British folksong compiled by Margaret Dean-Smith and others, promise much new light on the genesis of our

flourishing folksong. A further desideratum, which we hope the Society sometime provides us with, is a similar bibliography of the American folk lyric—another limbo. But Laws and Coffin deserve much credit for giving those enduring ephemera, the ballads, a local habitation and a name.

Ohio State University

FRANCIS LEE UTLEY

Quentin Anderson, *The American Henry James* (New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1957. xiii + 369 pp. \$6.50). BY the time that this review appears, Mr. Anderson's *The American Henry James* will surely have undergone critical examination in a depth and a perspective much greater than it rightly deserves. For it is not a large book; it simply puts down in some detail analyses and conclusions originally announced a few years ago in the pages of *The Kenyon Review* and of *Scrutiny*. These conclusions are at times startling, at times strange, and most often unacceptable, I think; but what it is important to notice—and a review coming this late should properly take such notice—is that Mr. Anderson is as much suggesting a *way* of reading James, particularly the later James, as he is suggesting a substantial and detailed interpretation of the novelist and his novels. Mr. Anderson's proponents so far (they are few) and his opponents (they are many)—both have concentrated their fire more on the second point than on the first. There has been, at the very least, a lot of smoke; and it seems to be getting in our eyes. So that we are presented with alternate views of Mr. Anderson's book—as the work of either an Acolyte really operating from the inside, or of a Young Priest threatening the Old Ones (and some of the younger ones too) who rule in the Sacred Grove and are alone entitled to access to the Sacred Fount.

What Mr. Anderson's antagonists have attacked is something that I judge can be properly attacked: his insistence that there was a "secret" relation between the work of the older and younger Henry James; that the younger James's essential story (a version of what Mr. Anderson calls the "bootstrap myth") of the need and the drive for man to create his own understanding of his world and so come to learn to live in it and, loving it, be loved by it—that this story is one that he learned from his father and his father's philosophizing; that his habits of mind were essentially allegorical, as were his father's;

and that his later novels can be understood in great and abundant detail as derivations from his father's system—post-Transcendentalist, Swedenborgian, etc. Mr. Anderson does not make his case here, I think, simply because he reads the elder James only in the light of the younger; so that we are given no adequately systematic account of what the elder James was up to. We are given an account of those elements in his work which bear upon Mr. Anderson's analysis of that of his son. This is simply inadequate historiography—critical or otherwise. And if this were all that Mr. Anderson were trying to do, one would well be justified to dismiss his book as just another of those curiously compulsive returns to source-hunting which have recently cropped up again, usually under the name of myth-criticism.

But this is not all that Mr. Anderson intends to say; indeed, it is not all that he does say. All this is meant to be supportive and confirmative for a much more general and more sweeping pronouncement, a critical pronouncement. Here is one longish instance of that pronouncement, one which is meant to be taken in the perspective of earlier pronouncements on the same subject. It has to do with the quality and achievement of James's later novels and how they are to be read.

What is prized [in *The Wings of the Dove*] is a mode of relating isolated figures to one another which depends on some abstract thesis about the nature of their common humanity.

The reason that this fact about James, that is, his remoteness from society as the ground of judgments about the differences and complexities in the world, has not been emphasized in these terms is obvious. It was at first believed that James was exclusively occupied with one segment of society. The belief that succeeded this was that James was exclusively occupied with an imagined situation in terms of technique. Neither of these views is wholly at fault; the trouble with them is that, pushed to extremes, they negate the most important truth about the social world in James's novels—that it is the world of his father's version of the bootstrap myth. This account of the world was neither arbitrary or false; it was, culturally speaking, an instrument of considerable power and nobility. But it did not offer enough modes of recognizing difference; it was asexual, ahistorical, and inhospitable to a genuine play of ideas; in a word, it was provincial.

When we consider *The Wings of the Dove* with this in mind, it appears that its defect is not its involution or obscurity, but the transparency which a psychology enfolding a metaphysics involves. . . . (pp. 239-240.)

And Mr. Anderson goes on—unfortunately not to discuss that “transparency” in and of itself but as an aspect of the younger James's commitment to the thought of the elder. Strategically this is, I think,

not the most rewarding of approaches, nor is it the proper one. Nonetheless, the example—in spite of the fact that it is not properly developed—manifests the fact that for Mr. Anderson the essential subject of *The American Henry James* is the way of James's later fictions, not the specific metaphysical potholes and boulders which cluttered up that way.

I repeat that it is curious that Mr. Anderson's detractors have not taken him upon this point; have, in effect, not seen that he has been making this point. Committed to the thesis that the later novels are great ones, armed with their own ineluctable visions, they will not see (or at least, see clearly) what is in front of them. Is it because it is much easier to beat down Mr. Anderson on the grounds of his rank amateurism as a historical scholar than it would be a debate with him over his subtle insistence that the work of the later James is, in a word, simply not novelistic enough to make it worth taking as seriously as, with some notable exceptions, we have tended to do? Or is it—and I think that this is much more likely—that Mr. Anderson's detractors just will not seriously entertain a proposition which might put some of their own work in doubt?

Unhappily, Mr. Anderson does not make out the best possible case for his contention as regards the later James. For his case is tied so closely to his influence-and-source-study that he himself too seldom takes the occasion to look at the novels in and of themselves, as potentially achieved works of art. His feeling for the life of the novel is decidedly Freudian—mobile, energized, qualitative. But he insists on tying that feeling down to historically determinate, almost Jungian categories—systematic, stable, quantitative. In short, he himself finally reads allegory as not a way of making fictions but as a way of categorizing—and establishing solid paradigms for—fictions. He notes and then bypasses the younger James's well-known objections to allegorizing. (Which, incidentally, is far different from not attending to those objections at all, as certain of his reviewers—more willing to take James at face value than he—have accused him of doing.) And then he establishes the form of the allegories—all the while assuming that *per se* he is demonstrating certain crucial incapacities in James's later novels. In his work (as his Dantean references indicate) typological exegesis gradually displaces explication; so that presently the novels are lost sight of and we find ourselves wandering in a maze of allegorized types and forms—our humanity, and James's too, left pretty much behind us. But then, Mr. Anderson would doubtless argue

that James himself wilfully left his own humanity behind him. There the matter had better be left to rest.

Yet I can conclude only that Mr. Anderson has not made out his case finally or fully. But he has once more raised issues which need, as such issues always need, our deep and steady attention. He fails, I think, because, like most source-hunters, he confuses possible genesis with possible meaning and import. Still, he challenges as critic. And it is in the second, critical, role which I think he should finally (and kindly) be judged and for which his book should finally (and humanely) be used—as it no doubt will be, when it is read by at least those of us who, happily, would be Old Priests in Groves other than that whose deity is Henry James, Jr.

The Ohio State University

ROY HARVEY PEARCE

Calendre, *Les Empereurs de Rome*, ed. Galia Millard (Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press, 1957. vi + 179 pp. Univ. of Michigan Contributions in Modern Philology, 22. \$5.00). EARLY in this poem the author names himself Calendre and explains that he is composing it in honor of his patron and friend Duke Ferry who has recently died. This Ferry has a son who displays no virtue, and Calendre is not sure what will become of him. The editor assumes very rightly that Ferry II of Lorraine, who died in 1213, is intended and that the bad son is his successor Thibaut II (1213-1220). This dates the poem quite closely (pp. 19-20).

This edition is an excellent piece of work. The plan is clear and concise. If Dr. Millard has erred at all it is on the side of brevity in a few instances. The reviewer would like to expand a little on the events that preceded Calendre's writing. In November 1212 young Frederick of Hohenstaufen allied himself with King Philip of France and was crowned Emperor a month later at Mainz. His rival Otto of Brunswick was receiving support, financial and otherwise, from King John of England. Frederick could depend only upon the southern part of his territory, which included Upper Lorraine, the fief of Duke Ferry. Renaut, the fourth husband of Countess Ida of Boulogne, had sworn allegiance to the French King, but he was greatly disgruntled by Philip's encroachment on his lands. He visited another would-be traitor, Thibaut of Bar-le-Duc, who proceeded to initiate an

anti-French coalition with Otto at the head and King John as a generous participant.¹ The result was the Battle of Bouvines on July 27, 1215, where Philip Augustus crushed all his foes, forcing Otto to disappear. Thibaut of Lorraine, the bad son, had flirted with this coalition when common sense, and probably the poet Calendre, should have persuaded him to support his proper suzerain Frederick—and Philip of France. His next step was just as annoying for he began to meddle in the affairs of Champagne, again following Bar-le-Duc. He opposed the succession of Thibaut, the son of Blanche of Navarre. Frederick moved in on him and Thibaut of Lorraine was obliged to make shameful amends in 1218. It is against this background that Calendre's account of the Roman Emperors is to be placed. One should not forget that the mother of Thibaut of Lorraine was Agnes, daughter of the Count of Bar-le-Duc. It is likely that the "premiere donteüre" of Thibaut, prejudicial to Lorraine (vv. 79-84), came from Bar-le-Duc, and this bad influence continued. The reviewer would place Calendre's work just before the Battle of Bouvines.

The editor demonstrates very clearly that Calendre used a chronicle close to the Anglo-Saxon version of Orosius, which is ascribed to King Alfred (pp. 6-18). Possibly he had a Latin version made from the Anglo-Saxon. Study of the language shows that Calendre was trying to write a literary *champenois* (pp. 27-32). Dr. Millard's characterization of the poet's versification and of his approach to his theme is under the heading of style (pp. 21-22). Only one minor point could be queried there. The reviewer doubts that taking a bedtime drink was an established custom around the year 1200. Calendre says (v. 4710), speaking of the era of Valentinian, that "Lors estoit chose acostumee . . ." Dr. Millard admits (p. 34) that this custom is seldom mentioned in mediaeval French literature.

Dr. Millard has established her text with extreme care (pp. 35-161). All variations from strict manuscript reading are indicated in the Notes (pp. 162-66) and difficult passages are explained there. In a few instances it might have been better to reverse this procedure. It is not possible to justify the reading *Que jusqu'anz anz la mer salee* (v. 960). Why not replace *Vintante* by *Uitante* in v. 1655? In vv. 527-28 the editor says that the reading could be *Scipio qui tant ot proesce Si il fu cheoiz an grant vellesce*. Perhaps the *Si* can be translated by 'until,' which we should expect only before a Future tense.

¹ Austin Lane Poole, *From Domesday Book to Magna Carta* (Oxford, 1951, p. 453).

The note to v. 2336 is not entirely clear. He (Augustus Caesar) had renounced the kingship; so the Spaniards would not serve him any more than they would another simple leader. The *il* is omitted. Dr. Millard watches the versification carefully, but except for the addition of *tremas* she only suggests emendations, in the Notes.

It is seldom that editors and critics can agree on what should go into a glossary. Dr. Millard wishes to include in hers (pp. 174-79) only difficult words and those of special interest. In v. 652, which reads *Mars esterlins, besanz, mangons* she renders *mangon* by 'écus d'or,' a coin which did not exist at the time. Surely *mangon* is inherited from the *Chanson de Roland*, with no particular coin in mind. We should translate the line by 'Marks of sterling pennies, gold besants from the East, Saracen gold.' The basic meaning of *aise et leu* must be 'occasion and opportunity.' (In *Raoul de Cambrai* v. 2792 *se aisement en ai* means 'if I have an opportunity'). The reviewer would translate *poralee* by 'noised about, gone around' rather than as 'accomplie.' The force of the prefix *por-* is that of a generalizer, and the verb is *aler*. Proper names are identified extremely well (pp. 167-73). All the names from Roman history are traced and the editor has been careful with local place names such as *Aube* for *Sarralbe* and *Dasbourg* for *Dabo*. *Annelius Mostumius* for *Aulus Postumius* is interesting. It suggests that at some time, in the history of the source, Aulus was read aloud as Anlus and in this form passed on to a scribe. Written transmission would hardly have corrupted this further to *Annelius*. Two of the proper names in Dr. Millard's list should have been given as common nouns. These are the two varieties of serpents: *Ynalis* and *Visillus*. The first of these must be the hypnalis; it kills Cleopatra by putting her to sleep.² The second may be for *Basileüs*, the king snake, where the Beta would be a bilabial spirant in current Greek pronunciation. This king snake sucks away the poison. Most interesting of all is the name of the author, *Calendre* or *Qualandre* (v. 4857). It is hardly French and it is not apt to be Germanic. It looks Greek. If some cognomen such as *Kalandrós* or *Kalandreîos* is at the root of it this would open the way to some additional speculation.³

The University of North Carolina

URBAN T. HOLMES, JR.

² In the King Alfred text this snake is called *ipnalis*. See the edition of Henry Sweet (London, 1883. Early English Text Society, 79, p. 246).

³ In v. 4864 *Calendre* refers to possession by Emperor Manuel of the source chronicle.

Kimberly S. Roberts, *An Anthology of Old Portuguese* (Lisbon: Livraria Portugal, n.d. Paper. 435 pp.). PROFESSOR Roberts' anthology is sure to become the standard textbook for courses in Old Portuguese. (I myself can testify to its usefulness as a classroom text.) Courses in Old Portuguese are, however, still very rare in this country, and it is likely that the book will be most used by those who wish to learn something about the language and literature of medieval Portugal and must do so on their own. It was perhaps with this in mind that Professor Roberts has attempted to make his book as nearly self-contained as is possible within reasonable limits of space. His anthology offers a generous sampling of texts representing all the major forms of medieval Portuguese literature and based on the best modern editions. (Many of the prose selections have, in addition, been checked against the original manuscripts.) There is an excellent etymological glossary which lists all words in the texts which either do not exist in modern Portuguese or are used today with a meaning different from that which they had in the older language. The words are glossed both in English and in Modern Portuguese; the latter feature should be especially useful to those students, probably the majority, who begin their study of Old Portuguese with little or no training in the language of today.

Many of the selections are provided with notes which touch on points of literary, historical, or, most frequently, linguistic interest. The notes are generally adequate, though many students will doubtless wish that the editor had chosen to give them a bit more help with some of the selections, particularly the difficult *cantigas de escarno e de mal-dizer*.

The book also contains very brief sketches of the early history of Portugal and of the development of Portuguese prose and verse in the medieval period. Here the need for brevity has led to a few unsatisfactory statements, as, for example, when parallelism is defined as "the repetition of lines throughout the poem" (p. 149), since this definition does not distinguish true parallelism from the *leixa-pren* which is often associated with it in the *contigas de amigo*. It is regrettable that the book contains no bibliography; the list of abbreviations of works cited, on pp. 17-20, will serve as a partial substitute, but surely there should be some mention of such works as Joseph Dunn's grammar of Modern Portuguese and of the more important histories of Portuguese literature.

The book has been handsomely printed in Portugal (in this country,

copies may be obtained directly from Professor Roberts); printing errors are few and most, if not all, of them are included in the list of errata.

The Johns Hopkins University

THOMAS R. HART, JR.

Denis Diderot, *Salons, Volume I: 1759, 1761, 1763*, ed. Jean Seznec and Jean Adhémar (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1957. xvii + 259 pp. \$20.20). LA noble bête de somme, Denis Diderot, paraît être arrivée à la classe de grand luxe. MM. Seznec et Adhémar nous ont procuré en grand format une édition de trois des neuf expositions d'art que Diderot a visitées pour les abonnés de la *Correspondance littéraire* de Grimm, dans leur premier volume des *Salons*, illustré généreusement et commenté. Les commentaires comportent un historique des salons biennaux, les listes des artistes exposants, de brefs résumés d'opinions contemporaines, autres que celles de Diderot, et d'utiles indications sur le sort des tableaux, gravures et statues que les visiteurs du Louvre ont pu admirer, ou dénigrer.

Le but des éditeurs était de publier les *Salons* séparément, de donner le meilleur texte—celui qu'ils considéraient comme le moins manipulé par héritiers et éditeurs—, d'établir la qualité de Diderot connaisseur d'art, et d'accompagner les dires par les faits, à savoir, montrer les œuvres qu'il avait eues sous les yeux. Pour servir de preuve à l'exacte description de Diderot les reproductions sont souvent trop petites, presque partout faibles et, quand il parle de couleurs, nous en sommes pour nos frais, car les planches sont en noir et blanc. Pourtant, on peut en tirer des leçons profitables.

Si le lecteur se contente de feuilleter, sans trop s'arrêter, ces chefs-d'œuvre du siècle, s'il lit, du même œil distrait, le texte de Diderot, l'impression sera infailliblement que cet art et que les critères de Diderot appartiennent à un temps révolu. En effet, quoi de plus désuet que ces sujets héroïco-patriotico-majestueux, ces grands du pays déguisés en Romains et accompagnés, par surcroît de gloire ou de clarté, de génies allégoriques; que 13 pieds sur 9 de mythologie ou de matière biblique, et, à peine moins spacieuses, des scènes touchantes d'intérieur ou de stratagèmes ingénieux du Dieu de l'Amour? Et le juge—"philosophe" qui, à ses débuts de critique d'art, ne semble apprécier une œuvre que selon le degré de ressemblance avec le modèle, qui exulte quand un bras en marbre donne l'illusion de la chair, qui

veut être touché aux larmes par une jeune fiancée ou par une pathétique Andromaque, qui donne à profusion des leçons aux peintres, dispose leurs personnages d'après ses idées à lui? Avant d'en venir à une évaluation plus juste de l'art et du salonnier du 18^e siècle, hâtons-nous de dire que nous avons beau jeu, nous, de ne pas juger notre art par les mêmes principes: nos artistes ne nous offrent plus guère d'objets à comparer à des modèles. Et ils ne font plus concurrence à la Nature, aux Anciens, aux Italiens, ou aux Hollandais. Ce qui nous touche dans les anciens maîtres c'est leur déviation de l'exactitude rigoureuse, leur réserve sentimentale ou leur force d'expression qu'ils n'avaient précisément pas trouvée chez les prédécesseurs ou dans les écoles. Mais voilà qu'en regardant de plus près la sélection de photographies dans ces premiers *Salons*, en lisant attentivement les commentaires de Diderot, nous découvrons des observations différentes de l'impression générale et, dans les planches, des exceptions bienfaisantes à la galanterie lisse et à la plate emphase qui semblaient la marque du 18^e siècle. Watteau, Fragonard, Houdon ne figurent même pas dans ces expositions, mais Chardin et La Tour font oublier facilement tant d'extravagances académiques.

Et voici ce que dit aussi Diderot—et remarquons qu'il se fait seulement la main dans le métier, qu'il s'instruit encore ici en instruisant ses lecteurs. Il trouve cette magnifique description du charme de Chardin: "Il a entendu la magie de la couleur." Se rendant compte de l'injustice du non-artiste à vouloir s'arroger un jugement:

Je ne serais point étonné qu'un peintre me dit: "Le bel éloge que je ferais de toutes les beautés . . . que vous n'y voyez pas!" . . . C'est qu'il y a tant de choses qui tiennent au technique et dont il est impossible de juger sans avoir eu quelque temps le pouce dans la palette!

Il arrive à se libérer de la hantise des anciens en disant: "N'est-ce pas une manière bien étrange que de ne regarder les Anciens que par leurs beaux côtés . . . et que de fermer les yeux sur leurs défauts? . . ." Il découvre aussi, chemin faisant, que la ressemblance n'est pas tout: "Tant que les peintres ne me feront que des ressemblances sans compositions, j'en parlerai peu." Et ailleurs:

Entre deux portraits, l'un de Henri IV mal peint, mais ressemblant, et l'autre . . . d'un faquin . . . peint à miracle, quel est celui que vous choisirez? . . . Qu'est-ce qui attache vos regards. . . Est-ce le mérite du ciseau de l'artiste ou l'admiration de l'homme? D'où je conclus . . . qu'il faut qu'un portrait soit ressemblant pour moi, et bien peint pour la postérité.

Il se lasse du trompe-l'œil :

Le bas-relief (illusoire) en paraît absolument détaché; cela est d'un effet surprenant et le peuple est fait pour en être ébahi; il ignore combien cette sorte d'illusion est facile. On promène dans nos foires de province des morceaux en ce genre, peints par de jeunes barbouilleurs d'Allemagne, qu'on a pour un écu et qui ne le cèdent en rien à celui-ci.

Les règles ne sont pas l'essentiel de l'art :

Je ne fais aucun cas des ouvrages où l'on est sûr de réussir en se conformant aux règles; c'est le mérite non de l'artiste mais des règles . . . ce n'est pas l'architecture: l'éloge, si elle en mérite, appartient à M. Contant (architecte contemporain); ce n'est pas la perspective: c'est l'affaire d'Euclide. Qu'est-ce donc? C'est l'effet de la lumière, c'est l'art de rendre l'air pour ainsi dire sensible. Cette vapeur légère qui règne dans les grands édifices. . .

Et pour finir, voilà la plus étonnante preuve de sa compréhension de l'indicible dans l'art—et de l'irréductible de la Nature :

Assemblez confusément des objets de toute espèce et de toute couleur, du linge, des fruits, des liqueurs, du papier, des livres, des étoffes et des animaux et vous verrez que l'air et la lumière, ces deux harmoniques universels, les accorderont tous, je ne sais comment, par des reflets imperceptibles; tout se liera, les disparates s'affaibliront, et votre œil ne reprochera rien à l'ensemble. . . . Qu'est-ce que (le) technique? L'art de sauver un certain nombre de dissonances, d'esquiver les difficultés supérieures à l'art. . . .

Ce qui explique aisément le cas qu'on a fait ces temps derniers de Diderot critique d'art. Et on verra mieux dans les *Salons* à venir.

Columbia University

EVA MARCU

Charles Baudelaire, *Les Fleurs du mal*, ed. Marcel A. Ruff (Paris: Jean-Jacques Pauvert, 1957. 465 pp.). BY actual count, there have been no less than two hundred editions of *Les Fleurs du mal*, exclusive of translations, since that work first appeared in 1857. Seventy-nine of these have been published since the beginning of World War II, a figure which does not indicate that Baudelaire's popularity is waning. To add to the number of existing editions without merely duplicating them is no easy matter; M. Ruff is therefore to be congratulated for having produced, not only a handsome and well-edited volume, but at the same time one which is strikingly original. He has deliberately ignored the traditional classification of Baudelaire's poetry, by restoring the six condemned poems to their

rightful place (a departure from custom initiated by the Club du Meilleur Livre), and by integrating into the text of 1861 those poems which Baudelaire presumably would have included in a third edition, a dream never realized. In other words, M. Ruff has tried to restore the volume's "secret architecture" in accordance with Baudelaire's expressed or implied wishes. M. Ruff admits, in his "postface en manière de justification," that his decisions are in part somewhat arbitrary and that some of them are even contestable. The fact remains that he has given us, for the first time, an edition of *Les Fleurs du mal* which at least approximates the ideal one that Baudelaire had in mind.

University of Wisconsin

W. T. BANDY

Neal Oxenhandler, *Scandal and Parade—The Theater of Jean Cocteau* (New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1957. 284 pp. \$5.00). "JEAN Cocteau, who is now an old man, has one of the supreme qualities of youth. He remains virtually indefinable." Professor Oxenhandler's study of Cocteau's theater, originally a doctoral dissertation presented at Yale University, succeeds in defining to a certain extent the greatly-maligned, greatly-admired academician. This is the first really objective and thorough study of one of the more important aspects of Cocteau's works to appear either in French or in English. It should open the door for further explorations of Cocteau's abundant work.

One is grateful to Mr. Oxenhandler for combining, throughout the book, a clear, readable, rapid style with a very perspicacious presentation and analysis of a rather difficult "hermetic" world. Behind the book one feels the solidly accumulated materials of a thesis. Sometimes one wishes that more of these materials could have been included in the volume. Particularly rich in suggestions are the pages of the first chapter "The entre-deux guerres" but they remain a little elliptical as Mr. Oxenhandler all too rapidly defines Cocteau's literary and intellectual inheritance. The comparison between certain aspects of Cocteau's theater and that of the German expressionists Ernst Toller, Georg Kaiser, and Ernst Wedekind, would have proved more enlightening had it been more substantially developed.

Mr. Oxenhandler briefly defines his method in a short introduction comparing it to Sartre's but insisting on an essential difference:

"Sartre makes no distinction between biography and the literary work. In this book I shall attempt to concern myself with *the author as he appears in his work*." The allusion to Sartre is really rather unnecessary. Mr. Oxenhandler wisely avoids any but the most general terms of the now somewhat worn-out Sartrian terminology and does not fall into the vicious circle of Sartrian criticism whereby the critic pulls out of a long circuitous disquisition precisely those terms with which he started. But why evaluate Cocteau in terms of Sartre? In point of fact—and happily for the reader—Mr. Oxenhandler uses a supple modern form of criticism combining a solid knowledge of the background, a scrupulous attention to the text, an aesthetic sensitivity to the meaning of symbol, pattern and form linked with a sense of their relation to the artist's inner motivations.

The thirteen chapters of the book with one exception—the analysis of *Renaud et Armide*—follow the chronological development of Cocteau's plays. Brief and clear summaries of each one of the plays help the reader to follow the critical analysis and appraisal. Mr. Oxenhandler isolates and interprets the dominant themes as they appear, themes he announces in the suggestive chapter heads. Mr. Oxenhandler is never repetitious and that in itself is a feat; but he sometimes leaves one with an impression that, like Cocteau, he has given us only an outer schema, a "parade," where he could safely have led us further inside, into the heart of the work. This reader at least would have welcomed a far more developed study of the language and symbols used by the playwright.

"Poetry as Charm" presents what in Mr. Oxenhandler's eyes constitutes Cocteau's most original dramatic creation: "In *Renaud and Armide* we find the complete and articulate vehicle of the poetic impulse which runs so clearly through all of Cocteau's works." Mr. Oxenhandler has succeeded in following that "poetic impulse" thus establishing the continuity of a work which presents such a startling diversity in form. The place which, in this context, he gives to two of Cocteau's lesser-known plays *Les Chevaliers de la table ronde* and *Renaud et Armide* seems highly justified.

Scandal and parade is a useful and distinguished book which illustrates very happily the value of a present trend in university publication: benefiting fully from the disciplines of serious scholarship, it is nonetheless accessible to the interested reader outside the narrow confines of specialized university circles.

New York University

GERMAINE BRÉE

H. W. Belmore, *Rilke's Craftsmanship. An Analysis of his Poetic Style* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1954. 234 pp.). SO thoroughly have we been steeped in a deluge of articles concerning the 'Weltanschauung' or the 'Mythos' of Rainer Maria Rilke that we get an immediate sense of relief just reading the words: "La poésie se fait avec des mots." This Mallarmé-phrase is the motto of a new book about Rilke, a competent study of his 'Gesamtwerk' as seen from the linguistic point of view.

Mr. Belmore's analysis, the most thorough and comprehensive yet attempted, clearly matches Rilke's highly developed sense of detail. The author, as expected, probes every possible angle of poetic technique, studies and scrutinizes the usual fields of inquiry as vowel sounds, enjambement, rhythm, and repetition, and even discusses the tempo and volume of the spoken poem. Following the meticulous process of dissection, a highly readable chapter, entitled, 'Development and Growth of Rilke's Style,' neatly epitomizes the pros and cons of the poetry in question. "Rilke's poetry," the author writes at the end, "reveals . . . all its depth only gradually and after patient and loving approach."

Some objections, however, may be raised against an approach that is too loving. For one thing, Mr. Belmore is sometimes tempted to justify matters that cannot be justified. There is, e. g., the chapter on rhymes in which he says, "Never is there the least trace of strain in Rilke's elaborate art of rhyming." (p. 18) Throughout the book this daring statement has to be modified many times. For nowhere does strain become more apparent than in an analysis of poetic style that necessarily has to limit itself to quotations of pieces or disconnected lines. Numerous rhyme-words are downright painful, starting with the insurpassable "Totenhammer-Wäscheklammer" and 'Seele-Kameele' down to 'Rosenstocks—Phlox.' Again and again the reader is reminded of the earliest Rilke, the poet of the *Larenopfer*. ("Jetzt beten, Willi—und nicht reden.")

Mr. Belmore also credits Rilke with more than average ingenuity in devising new words. Yet of the five dozen neologisms listed, more than a third are not new at all. 'Rühmlich,' 'Rühmung,' and 'Getast' were well-known even in Middle High German, 'abendklar' and 'antikisch' are found in Goethe, 'hinfinstern' and 'blumig' in Klopstock's *Messias*. Others include: 'Genist' (Gottfried von Strassburg), 'frühen' (Paracelsus), 'klugen' (Herder), 'Gequäl' and 'Hütung' (Voss), 'Instand' (Eckhart), 'Fühlung' (Ewald von Kleist), 'säglich' (Weckherlin), etc., etc.—Few—if any—of Rilke's

new words have taken root in the language at large. (Cf. such genuine Rilke-creations as 'schwergesässig,' 'verkeuschen,' 'winterwählig' or 'mädchenhändig'.)

Yet such 'Bruchstellen des Misslingens,' as Rilke called them himself, are, by no means, all-embracing criteria of his style. The author of the analysis is not unaware of existing flaws and counterbalances each negative statement with real insights into the achievements of his poet. "No criticism," he justly says about Rilke's poems, "is strong enough to destroy their virtues. . . . They rebound into the position which they hold."

One final remark about this position. In the process of proving Rilke's uncontested rank in the province of German letters, Mr. Belmore repeatedly emphasizes Rilke's supra-national outlook as compared with the 'somewhat cramped artificiality' of his German contemporaries. It is therefore all the more surprising that he does not try to define Rilke's position in the realm of European poetry as a whole. To be sure, occasional observations point in this direction. With regard to the *Sonnets to Orpheus* there is an allusion relating Rilke's 'newly acquired lightness' of versification to the influence of Paul Valéry. Baudelaire is also briefly mentioned as 'supplying some of Rilke's subjects' for the *Neue Gedichte*. On the whole, however, these interesting insights remain sketchy and insufficient.

A recent book about European poetry shows the vital importance of such an inquiry. Hugo Friedrich (in *Die Struktur der Modernen Lyrik von Baudelaire bis zur Gegenwart*) excludes not only Rilke but every other modern German poet from a heading or sub-heading. A less scanty treatment of Rilke's French models could have led Mr. Belmore to the same conclusions. That is to say, within the framework of European poetry Rilke as a craftsman was not a forerunner but a follower who, at his best, excelled in an already established poetic pattern.

University of California, Riverside

GUENTHER RIMBACH

R. Hinton Thomas, *Thomas Mann. The Mediation of Art* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956. 188 pp. \$4.00). THE aim of this book, as the author explains in his preface, is a "discussion of Thomas Mann's work, guided by a special concern with the aspect indicated in the title (and) built round a detailed examination of selected books." In order to give some distinction to the social and political aspects of Mann's work Mr. Thomas has adopted a different method of

approach for each of the novels selected, singling out *Death in Venice* to explore both "the possibilities of critical analysis" and the question of Mann's relationship to Goethe. Thus, apart from an introductory chapter which touches on some of the central themes in Mann's work, the book deals at some length with "Buddenbrooks," "Death in Venice," "The Magic Mountain," "Joseph and his Brethren," and "Doctor Faustus." The chapter "Apprenticeship to Literature" gives a cursory analysis of the early stories. A final chapter, "The Artist and his Function," and a reliable bibliography, which omits, perhaps purposely, some essays of minor importance (by J. Bab, W. Boehlich, A. Bauer, Max Rychner, H. Politzer, H. Braun) conclude this study.

Mr. Thomas seems to know Mann's work backwards and forwards and it is therefore natural that he makes the bulk of the great novels, their themes and main lines of development the center of his discussion. Competent though this is, it does not so much open new ground as define patiently and solidly the major aspects of Mann's work. Thus, there is hardly a new or startling idea in Mr. Thomas' study. In view of substantial secondary material, it is indeed difficult to see how any critic could still produce new vistas. Even Mr. Thomas' occasional attempts to inject new ideas into a much discussed subject either fail or have been made before as, for example, the constant references to Nietzsche. The comparison between *Death in Venice* and Goethe's *Elective Affinities*, is, regardless of striking parallels and Mann's own familiarity with Goethe's novel, by no means convincing. Of this the author seems to be aware himself (p. 64). Since Mr. Thomas puts particular emphasis on his interpretation of *Death in Venice*, a closer look at this chapter seems in order. A great many of the author's observations are subtle and their relation to the overall theme of his book is significant. I fail to see, however, how Mr. Thomas can claim in regard to Tadzio that "decadence lies at the very root of his existence, and it is not childlike innocence that his smile expresses" (pp. 64-65). Mr. Thomas does not say what he means by "decadence" in this connection. On the next page, however, in a discussion of Mann's stylistic qualities, Mr. Thomas seems to confute his own statement in quoting a passage from *Death in Venice* where Thomas Mann describes through the eyes of Aschenbach the "ausserordentliche Anmut," "die kindliche Verschämtheit," and "die wahrhaft gottähnliche Schönheit" of the boy Tadzio. Anyone reading this passage will certainly disagree with Mr. Thomas' previous statement. Disagreement will also be found among many readers with

the author's statement that in *Death in Venice* "the problems of the artistic existence are not seen here in contrast to the bourgeois world" (82), that "Aschenbach 'represents' Prussianized Germany" (83) and that in "no other work of (Mann's) . . . is so much social truth . . . such profundity caught in so small a compass" (84).

The chapters on *The Magic Mountain*, *Joseph and his Brethren*, and *Doctor Faustus* contain, thematically and symbolically, nothing new. The repeated attempts at stylistic analyses, however meritorious on the whole, occasionally carry *explication de texte* to extremes. For instance, the author relates the German words "Weckglas" (fruit jar) and "Eingewecktes" (that which has been preserved), which etymologically have nothing to do with "awaken," "waken" (wecken), to Hans Castorp's awakening, thus implying an associational meaning to them that those words cannot convey (pp. 108-109).

The least valuable and by far the weakest portion of the book is its last chapter, in which Mr. Thomas tries to define "the artist and his function." It is true that Thomas Mann has been one of the most controversial figures in German literature for the past 50 years, but this problem, like that of the artist's function, cannot be solved in ten pages. Matters become worse when Mr. Thomas adds to highly ambiguous distinctions by Stephen Spender some dubious ones of his own and connects these with Mann's own contradictory statements. Where does such an approach to the works and life of such an author lead us? Where are distinctions to be made between an author's life and his work, if the "political element" is essential . . . from every point of view" in Mann's work? And does a statement like this not refute almost all the good points Mr. Thomas has tried to make in his study? With these questions we might just as well leave this study, which serves as a comprehensive introduction to all those not familiar with other secondary sources.

New York University

EDGAR LOHNER

P. G. Foote, ed. *Gunnlaugs Saga Ormstungu*, with an English trans. by R. Quirk (New York: Thomas Nelson, 1957. xxxi + 47 pp. Icelandic Texts, 1. \$4.50). TO publish Icelandic saga texts with an English translation on opposite pages has long been the desideratum of scholars not least so the General Editors of these volumes, Sigurður Nordal and G. Turville Petre. When I was studying with Nordal in the early twenties I often heard him express the wish that we had such

texts, similar to the texts of the *Loeb Classical Library*. In advocating this, he was not proposing something quite unknown in Icelandic-English editions, for such had been the practices of editors for the *Rolls Series* (Eiríkr Magnússon and Guðbrandur Vigfússon) and Guðbrandur followed really the same practice in his *Corpus Poeticum Boreale* and *Origines Islandicae*, though in these editions the translations were put at the bottom of the page. To find scholars to edit and translate the sagas might prove a comparatively easy job, but where could a publisher be found to bring out the series? Obviously, the editors have succeeded in finding a publisher; he is Thomas Nelson and Sons of Parkside Works, Edinburgh 9, and he has already brought out Craigie's *Specimens of the Icelandic Metrical Romances*. It was logical that such a publisher should be found in Scotland, and if he brings out a complete series of his *Nelson's Icelandic Texts* he certainly will have deserved well of Icelandic Studies. There has never been a complete Saga Library of translations in English like the German *Thule*.

This first volume is headed by a full introduction, discussing *Gunnlaugs Saga* and its literary background, the sources of the saga, the author and his materials; then his way of handling them: composition, style and sentiment, his romantic outlook. The date and place of the saga are discussed, then the chronology within the saga. Finally the manuscripts are discussed. There is a select list of editions, in it I miss the edition in *Íslendinga sögur* by Valdemar Ásmundsson, Reykjavík 1893. Then there is a bibliography and a map.

The introduction is written by P. G. Foote, Lecturer in Ancient Scandinavian (Old Icelandic), University College, London. He has also done the editing of the text and the footnotes, textual and literary. He has also seemingly done the glossary of technical terms and the indices. But the translation is done by R. Quirk, Reader in English, University of Durham.

Both editor and translator have obviously done their task with the utmost care. I have found nothing but two printer's errors: *þaðan* for *þaðan* p. 19. line 6 from above, and *geisly* for *geisli* in stanza 20, p. 32.

All concerned are to be congratulated on the appearance of this first volume of *Nelson's Icelandic Texts*. The format of the book is rather unusual, especially in length. These volumes will undoubtedly be very handsome.

The Johns Hopkins University

STEFÁN EINARSSON

M. B. Salu, trans., *The Ancrene Riwele* (Notre Dame, Indiana: Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 1957. xxvii + 196 pp. \$2.75). SINCE the piece is so important and since not every student can or will handle the remote dialect of the original, it is well to have a good translation of the *Ancrene Riwele* in print. If for no other reason than that James Morton's translation is no longer in print, the appearance of Miss Salu's translation deserves attention. But more can be said for it than this. The Nero and Corpus MSS, dating from about the same time (ca. 1225-50), preserve the two texts of the *Riwele* which Professor Tolkien, who has in hand an edition of the Corpus text for the EETS, has found closest to the original. Although collations of the two versions are available in G. C. Macaulay's articles in *MLR* 9 (1914), the fact that Morton edited and translated the Nero version and Miss Salu has translated the Corpus now makes it possible for anyone to make his own general comparisons. Miss Salu's style is straightforward and attractive, and her translation as accurate as one could hope for. Occasionally there is an unnecessary freedom, as when "makieð ham to eotene wið chearitable chere" becomes "give cheerful meals" (p. 184); or a doubtful emendation, as when "tezeines þe sist men" (in MS. Cleopatra C. 6 "tezeines þe. þe isist men" in Macaulay's transcription, *MLR* 9. 472—surely not the "tezemes . . ." of Miss Salu's note, in which as elsewhere the Cleopatra MS is referred to by Macaulay's identification C without the abbreviation's having been previously explained) is replaced by "You cause men to sin" if you do not hide yourself (p. 186). The emendation has no connection with the reading, whereas if "sist" were taken as a mistaken use of the second person singular for the plural "seyn," occasioned by the objective "þe," a reading equally plausible and more in accord with the text emerges: "Men speak against you," i. e., "say ill of you" if you do not hide yourself. But it would be both ungracious and unfair to pursue this line, for the differences never materially alter either the sense or spirit of the original.

Dom Sitwell's introduction and appendices appear to be intended for devotional rather than for scholarly use. His attribution of the increase in the amount of mystical literature after the thirteenth century to the rediscovery of the works of Denis the Areopagite (p. xv) will seem to many inadequate. Since the introduction makes no pretense of really setting the *Ancrene Riwele* in context, one can hardly complain about omissions. Nevertheless, it is surprising to see Dietterle's early articles (1903-07) and Cheney's *English Synodalia* (1941)

mentioned with no reference to Arnould's *Manuel des Péchés* (1940). The translator's note is equally casual. Although other editions are mentioned, Pålsson's of the Pepys text is omitted. *JEGP* is referred to as the *Journal of Germanic Philology*. The references to friars are taken to date the Corpus text ca. 1230, and this is joined with Professor Tolkien's statement that the Corpus text "may even constitute a second edition within the knowledge of the author" to create a strong inference of an early thirteenth century date for the original version, an inference which Dom Sitwell takes as "conclusive evidence." Both he and the translator ignore completely the substantial evidence for an earlier date. Equally lightly Miss Salu suggests that Parts IV, V, and VI of the *Riwle* may be insertions by the author into his own previously written work. To say the least, it would take more than the few scraps of evidence here adduced to raise such a suggestion even to the level of a possibility.

Duke University

JOHN H. FISHER

Index

AUTHORS OF ARTICLES

- Adams, John F., "Wulf and Eadwacer": An Interpretation 1
- Barnett, H. A., A Time of the Year for Milton's "Ad Patrem" 82
- Baskett, Sam S., A Damsel with a Dulcimer: An Interpretation of Poe's "Eleonora" 332
- Bell, William S., The Prototype for Proust's Jean Santeuil 46
- Bensimon, Marc, *Les Foresteries* de Jean Vauquelin de la Fresnaie et les productions pastorales de la Pléiade 25
- Bieber, Konrad, Le Dédoublément de la personnalité chez Henri Bosco 272
- Boughner, Daniel, Jonson's Use of Lipsius in *Sejanus* 247
- Bowen, Vincent E., Two Unpublished Poems by Diderot 188
- Bowers, R. H., Impingham's Borrowings from Chaucer 327
- Broderick, John C., The Date and Source of Emerson's "Grace" 91
- Bruns, Friederich, "Den ewig Unge-nannten" zu Goethes Marienbader Elegie 522
- Bub, Douglas F., The Crown Incident in the *Hexenküche*: A Reinterpretation 200
- Cauthen, I. B., Jr., Another Webster Allusion in *The Waste Land* 498
- Clark, Richard C., The Poem "Van dem scholer van parys" 285
- Cope, Jackson I., Satan's Disguises: *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained* 9
- Creed, Robert P., *Genesis* 1316 321
- Edel, Leon, Time and *The Ambassadors* 177
- Edwards, Thomas R., Jr., The Colors of Fancy: An Image Cluster in Pope 485
- Engstrom, Alfred G., Poe, Leconte de Lisle, and Tzara's Formula for Poetry 434
- Erdman, David V., Coleridge as Nehemiah Higginbottom 569
- Evans, Oliver, The Protagonist of Hemingway's "The Killers" 589
- Fein, John M., Inconsistencies of Characterization in the *Periquillo* 428
- François, Carlo R., *La Vie antérieure* de Baudelaire 194
- Frazier, David L., Lucas Burch and the Polarity of *Light in August* 417
- Garrett, George P., Some Revisions in *As I Lay Dying* 414
- Gibson, Walker, Sound and Sense in G. M. Hopkins 95
- Gilbert, Allan, Were Spenser's *Nine Comedies* Lost? 241
- Gleckner, Robert F., James's *Madame de Mauves* and Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter* 580
- Granger, Bruce I., Illusion and Reality in Eugene O'Neill 179
- Grubbs, Henry A., Sartre's Recapturing of Lost Time 515
- Guthke, Karl S., Some Unidentified Early English Translations from Herder's *Volkslieder* 52
- Hagopian, John V., A Difficult Crux in Donne's *Satyre II* 255
- Hall, Robert A., Jr., The Satire of *The Yeomen of the Guard* 492
- Hamilton, A. C., Spenser's *Letter to Raleigh* 481
- Hatcher, Anna G., Se Hace Algo vs. Algo Se Hace 102
- Hatcher, Anna G., The Informant and the Adverb 355
- Heninger, S. K., Jr., Chapman's Plagiarism of Poliziano's *Rusticus* 6
- Hewett-Thayer, Harvey W., An Unpublished Poem by Immermann 115
- Horner, Lucie T., Alphonse Karr or Victor Fournel? A Needed Clarification 432
- Hunting, Robert, Mark Twain's Arkansas Yahoos 264
- Johnson, James W., Tertullian and "A Modest Proposal" 561
- Jones, George F., Ein Kind Daz Ere Hât 113
- Kissane, James, Classical Echoes in Hopkins' "Heaven-Haven" 491

- Kreuzer, James R., *The Swallow in Chaucer's "Miller's Tale"* 81
- LaGuardia, Eric, Edith Wharton on Critics and Criticism 587
- Lapp, John C., *On Zola's Habits of Revision* 603
- Lauter, Paul, *The Narrator of "The Blessed Damozel"* 344
- Leiter, Louis H., Herrick's "Upon Julia's Clothes" 331
- Livingston, Charles H., *Dialectal English pie* 325
- Lombard, C. M., *Dargaud and Lamartine* 192
- Maddison, Carol H., *The Source of du Bellay's "Les Louanges d'Amour"* 594
- Mahmoud, Parvine, *La Source d'une allusion de Victor Hugo* 108
- Manley, Francis, *An Explication of Dickinson's "After Great Pain"* 260
- Marshall, William H., *Thomas Traherne and the Doctrine of Original Sin* 161
- Matthews, J. H., *Emile Zola and Gustave Le Bon* 109
- McCready, Warren T., *Cervantes and the "Caballero Fonseca"* 33
- McKillop, Alan D., *Some Heroic Couplets by James Thomson* 12
- Miller, James E., Jr., *Billy Budd: The Catastrophe of Innocence* 168
- Mitchell, P. M., *The Grail in the Parcevals Saga* 591
- Monteiro, George, *Initiation and the Moral Sense in Faulkner's Sanctuary* 500
- Movnihan, William T., *Fall and Winter in Frost* 348
- Murray, W. A., *Donne's Gold-Leaf and his Compasses* 329
- Nedergaard, Leif, *Manuscripts de Pierre Bayle* 36
- Norton, Roger C., *Max Dauthendey's Lied der Weltfestlichkeit: Its Dates and Religious Significance* 116
- Owen, Guy, Jr., *Crane's "The Open Boat" and Conrad's "Youth"* 100
- Patrides, C. A., *Milton and His Contemporaries on the Chains of Satan* 257
- Pearce, Roy H., *A Small Crux in Allen Tate's "Death of Little Boys"* 419
- Pitou, Spire, *The Abbé Goujet's "Pot-pourri"* 597
- Ricks, C. B., *Wolsey in The Vanity of Human Wishes* 563
- Schulz, Max F., *John Trumbull and Satirical Criticism of Literature* 85
- Selig, Karl L., *Cervantes and the Jesuits* 514
- Sellstrom, A. Donald, *L'illusion comique of Corneille: The Tragic Scenes of Act V* 421
- Shepherd, James L., III, *The Contribution of a Directoire Exile to a Poem of Alfred de Musset* 39
- Sirluck, Ernest, *Milton's Criticism of Hall's Grammar* 8
- Slote, Bernice, *Transmutation in Crane's Imagery in The Bridge* 15
- Sokoloff, B. A., *Ethan Brand's Twin* 413
- Solomon, Eric, *A Source for Fitzgerald's The Great Gatsby* 186
- Steadman, John M., *Milton and St. Basil: The Genesis of Sin and Death* 83
- Steadman, John M., *Spenser and the Virgilius Legend: Another Talus Parallel* 412
- Stein, William B., *New Testament Inversions in Crane's Maggie* 268
- Stein, William B., *Santayana and Literary Tradition* 23
- Thormann, Wolfgang E., *Again the "Je Ne Sais Quoi"* 351
- Trueblood, Alan S., *Plato's Symposium and Ficino's Commentary in Lope de Vega's Dorotea* 506
- Van Eerde, John, *Baudelaire and Corneille: A Parallel* 601
- Very, Francis G., *Gomia versus Gumia, Gomia: an Emendation* 50
- Ward, W. S., *A Device of Doors in The Eve of St. Agnes* 90
- Wasserman, Earl R., *The Meaning of "Poland" in The Medal* 165
- Wehling, Mary M., *Marlowe's Mnemonic Nominology with Especial Reference to Tamburlaine* 243
- Welsh, Alexander, *A Melville Debt to Carlyle* 489
- Wilkins, Ernest H., *Ar Cadie* 504
- Wood, Cecil, *A Kenning for Blood?* 401
- Ziff, Larzer, *The Ethical Dimension of "The Custom House"* 338

AUTHORS OF REVIEWS AND OF BOOKS REVIEWED

- Aggeler, William F.: L. B. Hyslop and F. E. Hyslop, Jr., *Baudelaire, A Self-Portrait* 235
- Altick, Richard D., *The English Common Reader: A Social History of the Mass Reading Public 1800-1900* 132
- Anderson, Quentin, *The American Henry James* 622
- Azaceta, José María, ed., *Cancionero de Juan Fernández de Ixar* 67
- Bandy, W. T.: C. Baudelaire, *Les Fleurs du mal*, ed. Marcel A. Ruff 631
- Bandy, W. T., and Pichois, Claude, eds., *Baudelaire devant ses contemporains* 547
- Banta, Frank G.: E. Kranzmayer, *Historische Lautgeographie des gesamthairischen Dialektraumes* 396
- Barnwell, H. T., *Les Idées morales et critiques de Saint-Evremond* 231
- Bart, B. F.: M. Lecuyer, *Balzac et Rabelais* 459
- Baudelaire, Charles, *Les Fleurs du mal*, ed. Marcel A. Ruff 631
- Baym, Max I.: H. Wasser, *The Scientific Thought of Henry Adams* 301
- Belmore, H. W., *Rilke's Craftsmanship. An Analysis of his Poetic Style* 634
- Benediktsson, Einar, *Harp of the North: Poems*, trans. Frederic T. Wood 120
- Blake, William, *Vala*, ed. H. M. Margoliouth 297
- Bodmer, Daniel, *Die granadinischen Romanzen in der europäischen Literatur* 134
- Bradner, Leicester: J. Peter, *Complaint and Satire in Early English Literature* 57
- Bradner, Leicester: S. Jayne and F. R. Johnson, eds., *The Lumley Library: The Catalogue of 1609* 58
- Brée, Germaine, and Guiton, Margaret, *An Age of Fiction* 236
- Brée, Germaine: N. Oxenhandler, *Scandal and Parade—The Theater of Jean Cocteau* 632
- Brereton, Geoffrey, *An Introduction to the French Poets* 147
- Brinkmann, Richard, *Wirklichkeit und Illusion. Studien über Gehalt und Grenzen des Begriffs Realismus für die erzählende Dichtung des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts* 471
- Brown, John R.: I. Smith, *Shakespeare's Globe Playhouse: A Modern Reconstruction in Text and Scale Drawings* 364
- Buckley, Jerome H.: R. D. Altick, *The English Common Reader: A Social History of the Mass Reading Public 1800-1900* 132
- Büchner, Georg, *La Mort de Danton*, trans. and ed. R. Thieberger 553
- Buffum, Imbrie: M. de Montaigne, *The Complete Works of Montaigne*, tr. D. M. Frame 533
- Burdach, Konrad, *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Westöstlichen Divans. Drei Akademie-Vorträge* 151
- Calendre, *Les Empereurs de Rome*, ed. Galia Millard 625
- Cameron, Kenneth N.: N. Rogers, *Shelley at Work: A Critical Inquiry* 129
- Campbell, Harry M., and Foster, Ruell, *Elizabethan Madox Roberts, American Novelist* 303
- Cellier, Léon, *Gérard de Nerval, l'homme et l'œuvre* 139
- Chadbourne, Richard M., *Ernest Renan as an Essayist* 390
- Champigny, Robert: J. A. Frey, *Motif Symbolism in the Disciples of Mallarmé* 393
- Cope, Jackson I., *Joseph Glanvill, Anglican Apologist* 436
- Cordle, Thomas H.: S. Ullman, *Style in the French Novel* 551
- Correa, Gustavo, *La poesía mítica de Federico García Lorca* 465
- Craig, Hardin: A. Lombardo, *Il dramma pre-Shakespeareano: Studi sul teatro inglese dal Medioevo al Rinascimento* 612
- Crocker, Lester G.: A. M. Wilson, *Diderot: The Testing Years* 305
- Crocker, Lester G.: H. Wolpe, *Raynal et sa machine de guerre* 309
- Crow, John A.: B. Gicovate, *Julio Herrera y Reissig and the Symbolists* 469
- Diderot, Denis, *Salons, Volume 1:*

- 1759, 1761, 1763, ed. Jean Seznec and Jean Adhémar 629
- Doolittle, James: G. May, Diderot et Baudelaire critiques d'art 544
- Dunham, Lowell, Rómulo Gallegos, vida y obra, tr. G. Barrios and R. Montilla 461
- Einarsson, Stefán: D. A. Seip, Palaeography B Norge og Island 77
- Einarsson, Stefán: G. Lindblad, Studier i Codex Regius av äldre Eddan. With an English Summary 79
- Einarsson, Stefán: E. Benediktsson, Harp of the North: Poems, trans. F. T. Wood 120
- Einarsson, Stefán: W. P. Lehmann, The Development of Germanic Verse Form 149
- Einarsson, Stefán: P. G. Foote, ed., Gunnlaugs Saga Ormstungu, with an English trans. by R. Quirk 637
- Elias, Robert H.: C. C. Walcutt, American Literary Naturalism, A Divided Stream 299
- Eliason, Norman E., Tarheel Talk: An Historical Study of the English Language in North Carolina to 1860 64
- Engstrom, Alfred G.: L. Cellier, Gérard de Nerval, l'homme et l'œuvre 139
- Fisher, John H.: M. B. Salu, trans., The Ancrène Riwle 639
- Flys, Michael J.: G. Correa, La poesía mítica de Federico García Lorca 465
- Foakes, R. A.: H. S. Wilson, On the Design of Shakespearian Tragedy 294
- Foote, P. G., ed., Gunnlaugs Saga Ormstungu, with an English trans. by R. Quirk 637
- Françon, Marcel: H. Weber, La Création poétique au XVI^e siècle en France, de Maurice Scève à Agrippa d'Aubigné 227
- Frey, John A., Motif Symbolism in the Disciples of Mallarmé 393
- Frohook, W. M.: R. Giraud, The Unheroic Hero in the Novels of Stendhal, Balzac and Flaubert 314
- George, Albert J.: M. Regard, L'Adversaire des romantiques: Gustave Planche 458
- Giovate, Bernard, Julio Herrera y Reissig and the Symbolists 469
- Gilbert, Allan: P. A. Jorgensen, Shakespeare's Military World 613
- Girard, René: W. T. Bandy and C. Pichois, eds., Baudelaire devant ses contemporains 547
- Giraud, Raymond, The Unheroic Hero in the Novels of Stendhal, Balzac and Flaubert 314
- Gittings, Robert, The Mask of Keats: A Study of Problems 219
- Glauser, Alfred, Hugo et la poésie pure 387
- Golden, Morris: R. M. Wardle, Oliver Goldsmith 442
- Golino, Carlo L., ed., Carlo De' Dottori's "Il Parnaso" 135
- Greet, W. Cabell: N. E. Eliason, Tarheel Talk: An Historical Study of the English Language in North Carolina to 1860 64
- Grossvogel, David I.: L. S. Roudiez, Maurras jusqu'à L'Action Française 143
- Guggenheim, Michel: R. M. Chadbourne, Ernest Renan as an Essayist 390
- Halsband, Robert, The Life of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu 125
- Ham, Edward B.: P. Rickard, Britain in Medieval French Literature: 1100-1500 451
- Hamre, Haakon: A. H. Smith, English Place-Name Elements 616
- Hart, Thomas R., Jr.: K. S. Roberts, An Anthology of Old Portuguese 628
- Hilen, Andrew, ed., The Diary of Clara Crowninshield: A European Tour with Longfellow, 1835-36 367
- Hollyman, K.-J., Le Développement du vocabulaire féodal en France pendant le haut moyen âge 532
- Holmes, Urban T., Jr.: Calendre, Les Empereurs de Rome, ed. Galia Millart 625
- Hope, Quentin M.: H. T. Barnwell, Les Idées morales et critiques de Saint-Evremond 231
- Howell, W. S., Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700 206
- Hubert, Judd D., Essai d'exégèse racinienne: Les secrets témoins 537
- Hughes, Merritt Y.: R. Tuve, Images and Themes in Five Poems by Milton 527
- Hyslop, Lois B., and Hyslop, Francis E., Jr., Baudelaire, A Self-Portrait 235

- Jayne, Sears, and Johnson, Francis R., eds., *The Lumley Library: The Catalogue of 1609* 58
- Jorgensen, Paul A., *Shakespeare's Military World* 613
- Koch, Franz, *Idee und Wirklichkeit* 398
- Kossoff, A. David: E. I. Rivers, Francisco de Aldana, el divino capitán 454
- Kranzmayer, Eberhard, *Historische Lautgeographie des gesamtbaierischen Dialektraumes* 396
- Kurth, Arthur L.: R. Lebègue, ed., *Malherbe et Du Périer, Harangue pour le Prince de Joinville* 229
- La Harpe, Jacqueline E. de: R. Mortier, *Les "Archives littéraires de l'Europe" (1804-1808) et le cosmopolitisme littéraire sous le Premier Empire* 381
- Lapp, John C.: J. H. Matthews, *Les Deux Zola* 316
- Larrabee, Stephen A., *Hellas Observed: The American Experience of Greece: 1775-1865* 217
- Lattimore, Richmond: G. de F. Lord, *Homeric Renaissance: The Odyssey of George Chapman* 60
- Laws, G. Malcolm, Jr., *American Balladry from British Broad-sides* 620
- Lebègue, Raymond, ed., *Malherbe et Du Périer, Harangue pour le Prince de Joinville* 229
- Lecuyer, Maurice, *Balzac et Rabelais* 459
- Leefmans, Bert M.-P.: G. Brée and M. Guiton, *An Age of Fiction* 236
- Lehmann, Winfred P., *The Development of Germanic Verse Form* 149
- Leo, Ulrich: L. Dunham, *Rómulo Gallegos, vida y obra*, tr. G. Barrios and R. Montilla 461
- Levin, Harry: W. K. Wimsatt, Jr. and C. Brooks, *Literary Criticism: A Short History* 155
- Levin, Harry, *Reply to Comment* (see: Wimsatt, William K., Jr., and Brooks, Cleanth, *Comment on Harry Levin's Review of "Literary Criticism: A Short History"* 557) 560
- Lindblad, Gustaf, *Studier i Codex Regius av äldre Eddan. With an English Summary* 79
- Loftis, John: K. E. Wheatley, *Racine and English Classicism* 541
- Lohf, Kenneth A., and Sheehy, Eugene P., *Joseph Conran at Mid-Century: Editions and Studies, 1895-1955* 131
- Lohner, Edgar: R. H. Thomas, *Thomas Mann. The Mediation of Art* 635
- Lombardo, Agostino, *Il dramma pre-Shakespeariano: Studi sul teatro inglese dal Medioevo al Rinascimento* 612
- Lord, George de F., *Homeric Renaissance: The Odyssey of George Chapman* 60
- Lough, John, *Paris Theater Audiences in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* 137
- Louria, Yvette, *La Convergence stylistique chez Proust* 548
- Lublinsky, V. S., ed., *Lettres de Voltaire* 377
- Macksey, Richard: Y. Louria, *La Convergence stylistique chez Proust* 548
- Male, Roy R., *Hawthorne's Tragic Vision* 369
- Marcu, Eva: D. Diderot, *Salons, Volume I: 1759, 1761, 1763*, ed. Jean Seznec and Jean Adhémar 629
- Martinet, André, *La Description phonologique, avec application au parler franco-provençal d'Hauteville (Savoie)* 74
- Martini, Fritz, *Das Wagnis der Sprache. Interpretationen deutscher Prosa von Nietzsche bis Benn*, 2nd ed. 319
- Matthews, J. H., *Les Deux Zola* 316
- Maurin, Mario: A. Glauser, *Hugo et la poésie pure* 387
- May, Gita, *Diderot et Baudelaire critiques d'art* 544
- McClain, William H.: R. Brinkmann, *Wirklichkeit und Illusion. Studien über Gehalt und Grenzen des Begriffs Realismus für die erzählende Dichtung des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts* 471
- Merrill, Robert V., with Clements, Robert J., *Platonism in French Renaissance Poetry* 375
- Meyer, George W.: M. Moorman, *William Wordsworth, A Biography: The Early Years, 1770-1803* 444
- Miles, R. M., *Serial Publication in England before 1750* 615

- Miller, J. Hillis: K. A. Lohf and E. P. Sheehy, *Joseph Conrad at Mid-Century: Editions and Studies, 1895-1955* 131
- Montaigne, Michel de, *The Complete Works of Montaigne*, tr. D. M. Frame 533
- Moorman, Mary, *William Wordsworth, A Biography: The Early Years, 1770-1803* 444
- Mortier, Roland, *Les "Archives Littéraires de l'Europe" (1804-1808) et le cosmopolitisme littéraire sous le Premier Empire* 381
- Nehls, Edward, ed., *D. H. Lawrence: A Composite Biography, Vol. I: 1885-1919* 448
- Nelson, Robert J.: J. D. Hubert, *Essai d'exégèse racinienne: Les secrets témoins* 537
- Nicoll, Allardyce, ed., *Shakespeare Survey* 10 121
- Noce, Hannibal S.: C. L. Golino, ed., *Carlo De' Dottori's "Il Parnaso"* 135
- Nurmi, Martin K.: W. Blake, Vala, ed. H. M. Margoliouth 297
- Nykrog, Per, *Les Fabliaux* 373
- Oustinoff, Pierre C.: V. S. Lublinsky, ed., *Lettres de Voltaire* 377
- Oxenhandler, Neal, *Scandal and Parade—The Theater of Jean Cocteau* 632
- Painter, Sidney: K.-J. Hollyman, *Le Développement du vocabulaire féodal en France pendant le haut moyen âge* 532
- Pearce, Roy H.: Q. Anderson, *The American Henry James* 622
- Peter, John, *Complaint and Satire in Early English Literature* 57
- Pochmann, Henry A., *German Culture in America 1600-1900* 555
- Politzer, Heinz: A. Schnitzler and G. Brandes, *Briefwechsel*, ed. K. Bergel 317
- Politzer, Robert L.: A. Martinet, *La Description phonologique, avec application au parler franco-provençal d'Hauteville (Savoie)* 74
- Regard, Maurice, *L'Adversaire des romantiques: Gustave Planche* 458
- Richthofen, Erich V.: D. Bodmer, *Die granadinischen Romanzen in der europäischen Literatur* 134
- Rickard, Peter, *Britain in medieval French Literature: 1100-1500* 451
- Riffaterre, Michael, *Le Style des Pléiades de Gobineau, essai d'application d'une méthode stylistique* 68
- Riffaterre, Michael, *Réponse à M. Leo Spitzer: sur la méthode stylistique (see: Spitzer, Leo: M. Riffaterre, Le Style de Gobineau, essai d'application d'une méthode stylistique 68)* 474
- Rimbach, Guenther: H. W. Belmore, *Rilke's Craftsmanship. An Analysis of his Poetic Style* 634
- Rion, Mary L.: H. M. Campbell, and R. Foster, *Elizabethan Madox Roberts, American Novelist* 303
- Rivers, Elias I., *Francisco de Aldana, el divino capitán* 454
- Roberts, Kimberly S., *An Anthology of Old Portuguese* 628
- Rogers, Neville, *Shelley at Work: A Critical Inquiry* 129
- Rosenberg, Ralph P.: G. Büchner, *La Mort de Danton*, trans. and ed. R. Thieberger 553
- Roudiez, Léon S., *Maurras jusqu'à L'Action Française* 143
- Sainte-Beuve, Charles A., *Vie, poésies et pensées de Joseph Delorme*, ed. Gérard Antoine 310
- Salu, M. B., trans., *The Ancrene Riwe* 639
- Schnitzler, Arthur, and Brandes, Georg, *Briefwechsel*, ed. Kurt Bergel 317
- Seiferth, Wolfgang S.: K. Burdach, *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Westöstlichen Divans. Drei Akademie-Vorträge* 151
- Seip, Didrik Arup, *Palaeography B Norge og Island* 77
- Shakespeare, William, *King Henry VIII*, ed. R. A. Foakes 292
- Shannon, Edgar F., Jr.: P. Thomson, *The Victorian Heroine: A Changing Ideal, 1837-1873* 371
- Shattuck, Roger: G. Brereton, *An Introduction to the French Poets* 147
- Shedd, Robert G.: A. Nicoll, ed., *Shakespeare Survey* 10 121
- Shedd, Robert G.: P. N. Siegel, *Shakespearean Tragedy and the Elizabethan Compromise* 211
- Sherbo, Arthur: R. Halsband, *The Life of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu* 125

Sherbo, Arthur, Samuel Johnson, Editor of Shakespeare, with an Essay on "The Adventurer" 214

Siegel, Paul N., Shakespearean Tragedy and the Elizabethan Compromise 211

Silver, Isidore: R. V. Merrill with R. J. Clements, Platonism in French Renaissance Poetry 375

Smith, A. H., English Place-Name Elements 616

Smith, Irwin, Shakespeare's Globe Playhouse: A Modern Reconstruction in Text and Scale Drawings 364

Snow, Wilbert: A. Hilen, ed., The Diary of Clara Crowinshield: A European Tour with Longfellow, 1835-36 367

Spann, Meno: F. Martini, Das Wagnis der Sprache. Interpretation deutscher Prosa von Nietzsche bis Benn, 2nd ed. 319

Spilka, Mark: E. Nehls, ed., D. H. Lawrence: A Composite Biography, Vol. I: 1885-1919 448

Spitzer, Leo: M. Riffaterre, Le Style des *Pléiades* de Gobineau, essai d'application d'une méthode stylistique 68

Swedenberg, H. T., Jr.: C. A. Zimansky, ed., The Critical Works of Thomas Rymer 439

Taylor, Archer: P. Nykrog, *Les Fabliaux* 373

Thalmann, Marianne: F. Koch, *Idee und Wirklichkeit* 398

Thomas, R. Hinton, Thomas Mann. The Mediation of Art 635

Thomson, Patricia, The Victorian Heroine: A Changing Ideal, 1837-1873 371

Thorpe, C. D.: R. Gittings, The Mask of Keats: A Study of Problems 219

Tuve, Rosemond: W. S. Howell, Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700 206

Tuve, Rosemond, Images and Themes in Five Poems by Milton 527

Ullman, S., Style in the French Novel 551

Utley, Francis L.: G. M. Laws, Jr., American Balladry from British Broad-sides 620

Védier, Georges F.: J. Lough, Paris Theater Audiences in the Seven-

teenth and Eighteenth Centuries 137

Viggiani, Carl A.: C. A. Sainte-Beuve, *Vie, poésies et pensées de Joseph Delorme*, ed. Géraud Antoine 310

Waggoner, Hyatt, H.: R. R. Male, Hawthorne's Tragic Vision 369

Walcutt, Charles C., American Literary Naturalism, A Divided Stream 299

Ward, W. S.: R. M. Miles, Serial Publication in England before 1750 615

Wardle, Ralph M., Oliver Goldsmith 442

Wardropper, Bruce W.: J. M. Azaceta, ed. *Cancionero de Juan Fernández de Ixar* 67

Wasser, Henry, The Scientific Thought of Henry Adams 301

Watson, George I., A. E. Housman: A Divided Life 225

Weber, Henri, La Création poétique au XVII^e siècle en France, de Maurice Scève à Agrippa d'Aubigné 227

Wheatley, Katherine E., Racine and English Classicism 541

White, William: G. I. Watson, A. E. Housman: A Divided Life 225

Willey, Basil, More Nineteenth Century Studies: A Group of Honest Doubters 223

Wilson, Arthur M., Diderot: The Testing Years 305

Wilson, Harold S.: W. Shakespeare, King Henry VIII, ed. R. A. Foakes 292

Wilson, Harold S., On the Design of Shakespearean Tragedy 294

Wimsatt, William K., Jr.: A. Sherbo, Samuel Johnson, Editor of Shakespeare, with an Essay on "The Adventurer" 214

Wimsatt, William K., Jr., and Brooks, Cleanth, Literary Criticism: A Short History 155

Wimsatt, William K., Jr., and Brooks, Cleanth, Comment on Harry Levin's Review of "Literary Criticism: A Short History" (see: Levin, Harry: W. K. Wimsatt, Jr., and C. Brooks, Literary Criticism: A Short History 155) 557

Wolpe, Hans, Raynal et sa machine de guerre 309

Woodhouse, A. S. P.: J. I. Cope, Joseph Glanvill, Anglican Apologist 436

Woodring, Carl R.: B. Willey, More
Nineteenth Century Studies: A
Group of Honest Doubters 223

Young, J. H.: S. A. Larrabee, Hellas
Observed: The American Experience
of Greece: 1775-1865 217

Zimansky, Curt A., ed., The Critical
Works of Thomas Rymer 439

Zucker, A. E.: H. A. Pochmann, Ger-
man Culture in America 1600-1900
555

ical
Ger-
1900

Notes

MODERN IBERIAN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

A Bibliography of Homage Studies

Edited by HERBERT H. GOLDEN and SEYMOUR O. SIMCHES.
This unique research tool catalogs all the scattered studies on modern Catalan, Portuguese, Spanish and Latin American languages and literature which have appeared in "homage" volumes. It also offers a section of articles on the phonology, morphology, lexicography and dialectology of these languages, articles on their literature since 1400, on their folklore, and on their literary and intellectual relations with other countries. A complete index of authors, persons discussed and titles treated is included. \$4.00

Through your bookseller, or from



HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

79 Garden Street, Cambridge 38, Massachusetts

SPECIAL COMBINATION OFFER

Modern Language Notes: regularly \$6.00 } **BOTH**
ELH regularly \$4.00 } **for**
\$8.00

To receive both journals at a saving of \$2.00, simply send us your order with remittance of \$8.00.

Note: This offer limited to individual subscribers;
not available to libraries and other institutions.



The Johns Hopkins Press

HOMEWOOD • BALTIMORE 18 • MARYLAND

The Complete Essays of Montaigne

TRANSLATED BY DONALD M. FRAME

"It is a matter for rejoicing that we now have available a new translation that offers definite advantages over even the best of its predecessors."—*The New York Times*. "A remarkable rendition of Montaigne's style."—*Journal of the History of Ideas*. "A brand new translation of Montaigne into contemporary English which preserves both the spirit and the letter of the original. . . . Magnificent translation."—Cyril Connolly, *The Times* (London). A big, handsome edition of over 900 pages.

\$5.75

Pope and the Augustan Stage

MALCOLM GOLDSTEIN

An important supplement to the biographies of Pope that demonstrates the appeal of early eighteenth-century drama to a man of great taste and intelligence.

\$4.00

A Portuguese-English Dictionary

JAMES L. TAYLOR

"All who have deplored the unavailability of a serviceable, comprehensive Portuguese-English dictionary . . . will welcome Mr. Taylor's 60,000 entry answer to this need, and one may expect it to become standard for libraries and for the translator and the student."—*Library Journal*.

\$11.50

STANFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Stanford, California

7372

